The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXXXI NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1930 No. 3417

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 719
EDITORIALS:
- Judge Clark's Decision 722
- Revolution in Spain 723
- A Life for a Life 723
- In Defense of Weather 724

WHAT HOPE FOR DISARMAMENT? By W. T. Stone 725
UNCLE ANDY AND HIS TAX REFUNDS. By Paul Y. Anderson 727
COACH WINDOW. By Selden Rodman 728
THE YELLOW-DOG INJUNCTION. By Joel I. Seidman 729
GOING TO SCHOOL IN RUSSIA. By Ferdinanda W. Reed 731
IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 732
CORRESPONDENCE 733
BOOKS, MUSIC, DRAMA:
- A Parting. By Virginia Moore 735
- William Hazlitt. By Henry Hazlitt 735
- Mr. Bennett Lets Us Down. By Granville Hicks 736
- The Pivot of Politics. By George E. G. Catlin 736
- Kriegsschuldfragen. By Frederick L. Schuman 737
- The Flavor of Folk Poetry. By Eda Lou Walton 738
- The Puritan Mind. By Samuel Eliot Morison 738
- Why Bismarck Fell. By Mauritz A. Hallgren 739
- Pre-War America. By L. E. Robinson 740
- Books in Brief 740
- Music: Peace Without Euphony. By Arthur Mendel 741
- Drama: Another Polite Comedy. By H. H. 742

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE 742
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION:
- The Balance Sheet of the Revolution. By Blas Urrea 744

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD,* EDITOR
HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY, MANAGING EDITOR

ASSOCIATE EDITORS
DOROTHY VAN DOREN FREDA KIRCHWEY
MAURITZ A. HALLGREN ARTHUR WARNER

DRAMATIC EDITOR JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH
LITERARY EDITOR HENRY HAZLITT

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS
JOHN A. HOBSON HEYWOOD BROUN H. L. MENCKEN
NORMAN THOMAS LEWIS S. GANNETT CARL VAN DOREN
MARK VAN DOREN LUDWIG LEWISOHN

DAVID BOEHM, ADVERTISING MANAGER

* Absent in Europe.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50; and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, No. 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. British Agent of Subscriptions and Advertising, Miss Gertrude M. Cross, 23 Brunswick Square, London, W. C. 1, England.

CONGRESS RECESSED for the holidays with the Administration forces almost completely in command of the immediate situation. The sum of $116,000,000 was appropriated for emergency-construction work, $45,000,000 for drought relief, and $150,000,000 for the Farm Board. More immediately to the point, the President was given the authority he asked to allocate the construction fund as he thought best, and the word "food" was omitted from the uses to which the drought-relief fund may be put. The net result of the action thus far taken is to put the entire public responsibility for unemployment relief on the States and local government units, as desired by the President, without any suggestion of federal aid. Final Senate acceptance of these bills was made in the face of a vigorous protest from Senator La Follette, who declared that letters which he laid before the Senate constituted "a complete refutation of the idea that the situation is well in hand." The trouble with the President's position is that he has consistently played down the facts of unemployment, and there is accordingly too little public confidence either in the accuracy of the information on which he relies or in the adequacy of the measures to which he pins his faith. This is no time for a do-nothing policy with regard either to unemployment relief or to plans for the prevention and the meeting of future unemployment, but the President's whole aim seems to be to get Congress out of the way with just as little done as possible about unemployment or anything else. By deciding not to report the World Court protocol at this session the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has smoothed his path somewhat, and it is reported that no action on adherence to the World Court will be taken in advance of the regular session.

THE ADMINISTRATION won completely in the matter of appointments to the Power Commission. Threatened opposition to Frank R. McNinch, the North Carolina Hoovercrat, crumbled after Senator Morrison announced his support, and the North Carolinian was confirmed by vote of 47 to 11, 14 Democrats, including Barkley and Wheeler, voting for him. George Otis Smith was confirmed as chairman by vote of 38 to 22, after criticism by Senator Dill on the ground of Mr. Smith's preference for private rather than public operation of power projects. The other nominations were ratified without serious opposition. The whole incident is illuminating. Here is one of the most important federal commissions, whose policies are bound to have highly important political as well as economic results. Instead of appointing outstanding men of undoubted attainments and competence, the President names five appointees of most of whom little or nothing is known, either good or bad, and one of whom is nominated as a straight-out political reward. Unable to find that any of them has direct power-company connections, the Senate feels unable to reject them because of lack of positive qualifications, and accordingly has no option but to ratify the President's choice. The appointments are a rather sad commentary on our standards of qualification for important public positions, and they do not lead to high hopes for effective work by the reorganized commission. Unless it does function vigorously, the growing movement for public operation of power plants will be yet further hastened.

THE ATTACK UPON SENATOR NORRIS by Robert H. Lucas, executive head of the Republican National Committee, will evidently precipitate a first-rate row among the Progressive and regular Republican ranks in Congress, and it is to be hoped that it may further the process of cohesion among the Progressives. To those who feel that Senator Norris, sometimes single-handed, has consistently upheld the finest traditions of American politics, and who applaud his services in the Senate for their disinterestedness, industry, and clear thinking, this diatribe from Mr. Lucas will cause resentment and indignation. But it cannot really harm the senior Senator from Nebraska, and it may serve to clarify considerably the issue of how far party affiliations should go. Mr. Lucas, as a result of investigations by the Nye campaign committee, is disclosed as having disbursed some four thousand dollars for literature and cartoons attacking Senator Norris in the last campaign, which money, according to Mr. Lucas's testimony,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was not contributed by the regular Republican organization but was furnished partly by kind friends and partly from his own pocket. This information was not, as may be imagined, freely given by Mr. Lucas but was dug out of him during the committee investigation. It is, of course, thoroughly discreditable not only to himself but to the Republican organization which he represents. For the attack on a party member, whether regular or not, was, by any standard, sly, under-cover, and cowardly. Mr. Hoover, whatever he may think of Senator Norris, should find occasion to repudiate Mr. Lucas and his tactics.

SECRETARY STIMSON and his colleague in the Department of Labor, Mr. Doak, have come to the rescue of the immigration-law tinkers in Congress by suggesting a flat reduction of 90 per cent in the numbers to be admitted under the quota. Senator Reed of Pennsylvania and Representative Albert Johnson of Washington, it will be remembered, have introduced bills suspending general immigration for two years. The Reed bill leaves intact present preferences in favor of wives and near relatives of American citizens of foreign extraction, while the Johnson bill leaves the door open to such relatives of aliens undergoing naturalization. Senator Reed was "more than shocked" to discover that his bill would cut immigration from Northern and Western Europe as against that from the East and South so as to change the present ratio of five to one in favor of the former to a ratio of only one to eleven, thus in effect repealing our sacred national-origins principle. The Department of State under a strained interpretation of existing legislation is already cutting immigration to a fraction of the moderate numbers allowed under the present law. We can see no sound excuse for further legislative restriction, and we should regret to see another sop thrown to those alien-haters whose real desire seems to be to close our ports against all foreigners.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE is coming to the front in the form of various legislative proposals. Senator Wagner announces his intention to introduce in Congress a bill providing for such insurance and a resolution for a joint committee of House and Senate to study private and public systems here and abroad. The details of his plan have not yet been made public. The American Association for Labor Legislation, after months of study and consultation with experts, has prepared a bill which will be presented to twenty State legislatures this winter. It requires all employers to pay 1½ per cent of their wage bill into a fund out of which workers may receive benefits not exceeding ten dollars a week for a period of thirteen weeks. Placing the direct cost of the system entirely on employers, the measure seeks to give them the maximum of freedom in meeting its requirements and at the same time to afford them every possible incentive for stabilization. The association has tried to adapt its bill to our special conditions, and it seeks to popularize the measure by christening it as an American plan. Very interesting also is the announcement in a United Press dispatch from Philadelphia that the American Federation of Labor has a plan, to be made public in full on January 12, for an unemployment fund to be raised by joint contributions from employers and the government. This plan, it is stated, will be embodied in a bill to be presented in Congress. This announcement made by Edward F. McGrady, general organizer of the federation is somewhat surprising in view of the strong opposition to compulsory insurance that has heretofore been voiced by federation leaders like Matthew Woll, who denounces such protection as a "dole." Apparently the events of this year are making their impression within the federation.

RUSSIAN DUMPING and forced labor are reported to have been made the subject of a confidential report to the economic section of the League of Nations, and the findings of the report are summarized in rather startling fashion in a series of articles by the Geneva correspondent of the New York *World*. According to this writer, forced labor on a considerable scale actually exists in Soviet Russia, notably in the lumber industry, and under shocking conditions of ill-treatment, privation, and disease. Dumping in the strict sense, it is said, is systematically practiced in Europe, where the inability of Russia to offer goods of better quality than those of her competitors has been offset by underselling, the depression of prices below those of world markets enabling Russia to get its products into nearly all the Continental countries, even those already suffering from overproduction. On the other hand, where competition is strong or tariff protection high, Russian prices remain low only until those obstacles are overcome, and then rise to practically the world level. The United States is represented as not greatly disturbed by dumping, in spite of the fact that its lumber industry is particularly affected, while in no country, apparently, is it difficult to find agents ready to handle Russian goods. As the data for the report are said to have been supplied by Russian refugees and by intelligence-service records, diplomatic reports, and private information, it is clear that the report should be accepted with all reserve. On its face it appears to savor strongly of anti-Russian propaganda.

STALIN'S POSITION as political dictator of Soviet Russia has certainly appeared to the outside world secure enough, but it has been made doubly safe, to all appearances, by the dismissal of Alexei Rykov from the office of chairman of the Council of People's Commissars. The spectacle of a dictator who holds no government office turning out an official whose post was substantially that of a prime minister is one of the anomalies in government of which Russia has afforded many other examples. Precisely why Rykov was "fired" we shall doubtless know more fully later on, but his principal offense appears to have been his opposition to the rigorous pushing of the Five-Year Plan to which Stalin is committed. Rykov, it has been reported, would have eased the strain by spreading the program over six years, and would also have restricted the export of wheat and other food products in order that Russian workers might be better fed. All this, of course, classed him with the right wing, and his dismissal is apparently to be taken as evidence of Stalin's intention to make an end to opposition from that quarter. The only other prominent right-winger who still holds an important office is Nicholas Bukarin, who is a member both of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and of the Supreme Economic Council. It is freely predicted that Bukarin will follow Rykov into retirement. If he does, Stalin will reign supreme, and effective political dissent in Russia will have ceased to exist.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MUSSOLINI'S ATTEMPT to make the United States the scapegoat for Italy's economic difficulties would be laughable if it were not such a serious matter for the Italian people. Quite apart from the fact that the Wall Street gambling orgy cannot very well be held responsible for the overproduction of raw materials throughout the world, for the fall in the price of silver, for the hoarding of gold, or for many other difficulties that have been blamed for the world-wide depression, Mussolini surely cannot contend that this speculative boom had anything whatever to do with Italy's basic economic deficiencies. The Wall Street break-up did not deprive Italy of the fuel supplies and raw material whose lack has for years been hampering her progress. Neither did it have anything to do with Italy's inability to overcome these deficiencies under a government that prefers to spend $261,000,000 a year on its military machine (a 700 per cent increase over 1913) rather than on productive industry. Mussolini may have succeeded for the time being in deflecting attention away from fascism's shortcomings by dragging this red, white, and blue herring across Italy's trail of red ink, but he has not thereby advanced any nearer to a solution of Italy's very serious problem. Only a few days before Mussolini offered this apology for the unexpectedly large budgetary deficit and for the consequent 12 per cent reduction in state salaries, his Finance Minister was explaining to parliament that further salary cuts will soon be needed, and perhaps also a considerable increase in taxes, because the true size of the deficit had been greatly underestimated.

AGAIN THE HOOVER-STIMSON administration of foreign affairs has run afoul of a Latin American situation that has left these two perhaps otherwise able gentlemen looking slightly silly. On the very day that the provisional President of Guatemala, Baudilio Palma, was being forced out of office by a revolutionary leader, General Manuel Orellana, it was announced in Washington that President Hoover had sent Palma a message congratulating him upon his accession to the office and wishing him a successful administration. A somewhat similar blunder was made in connection with the Washington Luiz government in Brazil just before it was overthrown. There is evidently something wrong with our diplomatic service in Latin America when a mistake of this character can be made twice within a few months. The Guatemalan situation has left the State Department with another recognition problem on its hands, but unlike the Bolivian, Peruvian, Argentine, and Brazilian problems, which Mr. Stimson solved by resorting to a policy of expediency, the department in the present case finds its hands tied by its pledge to uphold the Central American treaty of 1923. Under the treaty no government that comes into power by force can be recognized by any of the other Central American states. The United States has undertaken to follow the same policy in so far as these countries are concerned. At the moment, however, Orellana seems to be as firmly and as legally intrenched as any of the South American governments recently recognized, which explains Mr. Stimson's perplexity.

PRESIDENT BUTLER of Columbia University, in his annual report to the trustees, offers a suggestion with regard to university athletics that is well worth the consideration not only of universities but of the public as well. Athletics, according to President Butler, are in themselves altogether desirable; even intercollegiate athletics, when they do not require too heavy a drain upon student resources, both mental and physical, have their place. The trouble with athletic competition today, however, is that it has become a large-scale industry; millions of dollars are invested in stadia, athletic contests draw gate receipts well up into the thousands, and the university expects to derive a large financial profit from the result. Therefore, says President Butler simply, away with the gate receipts; let the alumni endow athletics and remove them from financial pressure.

> If there were no gate receipts to be sought and none of the glory that produces gate receipts to be gained, it would then appear possible so to organize the administration and control of athletic sports and intercollegiate athletic contests as to secure the continued interest and cooperation not only of the undergraduate students but of the great body of alumni and to gain from these sports and contests a maximum of benefit.

Two things stand in the way of realization of some such scheme. One is the money already invested in athletics; the other is the probable reluctance of university officers to engage in a further campaign for endowment over the protests, possibly, of the very persons from whom the money must come. It will be necessary to institute a campaign of education first. And for that President Butler's proposal is an excellent first step.

HENDRIK WILLEM VAN LOON is making a very pretty gesture in his suit to discharge from bankruptcy the name of his countryman, Rembrandt van Rijn. Rembrandt died in penury with known debts of several hundred florins standing against him. Mr. van Loon now requests, in the name of Rembrandt's descendant, Warner van Lennep, a student at the University of Utrecht, that everyone having claims against the painter bring them forward for adjudication. It is likely, of course, that the statute of limitations will operate, since the debts are nearly three hundred years old. But Rembrandt's name will be cleared by the suit, not, as Mr. van Loon says, because "Rembrandt needs it for his reputation, as much as because I feel we need it for ours." This proceeding opens up all sorts of possibilities for admirers of demised great men. Was the Dark Lady of the Sonnets a legitimate connection of one William Shakespeare? Who will defend his name? Did Milton's young wife leave him after less than a week of marriage for any good reason? Did Mozart, when he died in poverty, pay every penny that was owing to his landlady? Who will champion Shelley the wife deserter, Byron the adulterer, Marlowe the murderer, Villon the thief? This is not by way of bringing up to ridicule Mr. van Loon's loyalty to Rembrandt, but it is a reminder that great men whose names we fondly and proudly remember were not always gentlemen or what is commonly thought of as decent or even honest, and many, many times they were too poor to pay their debts. Genius must be its own excuse for being; the rest of the world may profit by it without scrutinizing too closely its manners or morals while, with a sublime disregard for others, it walks the earth.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Judge Clark's Decision

THE now famous decision of Judge William Clark, of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, invalidating the Eighteenth Amendment adds twelve and one-half newspaper columns, or about seven running yards as such columns go, to the available material for the prohibition debate, although not, apparently, quite the kind of material that either the wets or the drys expected. Stripped of its masses of verbiage and irrelevance and its imposing citations of authorities all the way from John Marshall to Walter Lippmann, the decision holds that the amendment is invalid because it was not ratified by conventions in the several States. In Judge Clark's view, if a proposed constitutional amendment "is one designed to transfer to the United States powers heretofore reserved to the States, or, if there be any such, to the people," a proper interpretation of Article V, relating to amendments, in the light of the principles of political science requires that ratification should be given by a convention instead of by a State legislature. The reason for this obligation, Judge Clark contends, lies in the fact that a convention is "a better vehicle for the expression of public opinion than a State legislature." Moreover, the Supreme Court having held that Congress, when it submits a constitutional amendment, is not performing a legislative function, "it follows," Judge Clark points out, "that the nature of its function is administrative." That being the case, its action is subject to judicial review, and an application of the principles governing such review leads to the conclusion that the submission to the judgment of State legislatures of amendments transferring powers from the States to the United States would violate the spirit of Article V and hence "constitute an abuse of discretion on the part of Congress in its capacity as an administrative agent."

The decision, as was of course to be expected, has been promptly appealed by the government to the Supreme Court, so in due time we shall know what that tribunal thinks about it. That it will be affirmed seems highly improbable. The language of Article V is extremely simple and apparently clear. The article provides that amendments, whether proposed by Congress or by a convention called for the purpose, "shall be valid, to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be provided by Congress." It may fairly be assumed, we think, that the States, when they ratified the federal Constitution in their conventions, waived any right they may have had to limit Congress either in the kind of amendment it should propose or in the method of ratification which it should prescribe. The Supreme Court, in the case of Hawks *vs.* Smith, an Ohio case in which the question of the method of ratifying amendments was at issue, was unanimous in holding that both methods of ratification "call for action by deliberative assemblies of the people, which it was assumed would voice the will of the people."

Judge Clark rightly dismisses as outside the case before him the possible effect of his decision, if it should be sustained, upon the validity of other amendments than the Eighteenth, although he finds that aspect of the matter so attractive that he permits himself to discourse about it to the extent of a newspaper column. All the amendments except the Fifth may, he suggests, be passed over as not in danger. The "due process" clause of the Fifth Amendment, on the other hand, "might," he thinks, be tested somewhat as follows. Since the Eighteenth Amendment "does not and could not," in the absence of direct declaration, abrogate the "due process" which the Fifth Amendment guarantees, "any action thereunder must be regarded in the light of what is reasonable. The more advanced school of constitutional thinkers consider this 'reasonableness' from the point of view of the efficacy of the remedy prescribed for any particular evil"; and since the Supreme Court has found vaccination and sterilization "efficacious in preventing the spread of smallpox and idiocy," and hence free from attack as violative of "due process," the efficacy of the Eighteenth Amendment and its accompanying legislation in preventing the spread of intemperance might be used as a similar test. Judge Clark admits that the application of the test would be very difficult, but he nevertheless hopes that "some day," in "some court," it may be tried.

All this, of course, like much else in the decision, is merely *obiter dicta* and unctuous preachment. As the decision does not affect the question of the propriety of prohibition, the enforcement of the system may be expected to go on as heretofore until the Supreme Court has had its say. Far-fetched as the decision seems to be, however, Judge Clark has performed a useful service in exposing the unsatisfactoriness of the amending process as Congress has uniformly applied it, and in challenging the notion that judicial decisions, once made, should be stuck to with something akin to awe. Whatever the liberty which the Constitution allows, it is evident that insistence upon legislative ratification instead of ratification by conventions has made it possible to jam through amendments which would almost certainly have been rejected if the people had had a chance at them. We should not have had the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments but for the approval given by rotten legislatures in a reconstructed South which a Republican Congress controlled, and it is quite possible that we should not have had the Eighteenth Amendment if conventions had been asked to pass upon it. It may very well be, therefore, that Judge Clark's pronouncement will hasten somewhat the calling of a national convention to revise the Constitution for which some thirty-five States, at one time or another, have asked. Be that as it may, the decision is a challenge to Congress to adopt in the future a method of ratification more in keeping with the nature of popular government than is the one which it has thus far employed, and an invitation to the Supreme Court to reconsider some of the positions which it has taken in interpreting and applying the Eighteenth Amendment. We may, in short, get something more sensible and scientific in the way of federal jurisprudence even though the amendment which Judge Clark has read out of the Constitution continues to stand.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Revolution in Spain

SPAIN'S revolution is long overdue. It could have come at the time of the French Revolution 140 years ago; it could even have come as recently as ten years ago and still have had healthy consequences. Instead, it has been delayed these many years, principally because of the inertia of the Spanish people, whose normal attitude toward politics and government is one of amused indifference. Apparently it has lately been once more delayed, but even so the revolutionary house-cleaning which Spain desperately needs will have been only postponed.

A century or more of military rule, abetted by the clergy and in the last decade supplemented by a playboy king's sophomoric attempts at dictatorial government, has piled up for Spain a political heritage upon which it is probable neither parliamentary rule nor dictatorship can safely rest. It has brought into being at least two score factions and cliques, most of which are anxious to overthrow the monarchy, but none of which is strong enough to do this alone or to establish any substitute form of government likely to be stable or lasting. Moreover, their constant quarreling among themselves has thus far made it impossible for a sufficient number of these groups to unite in a real revolutionary effort, while the intensity and complexity of their quarrels hold no happy omen for any revolutionary government, should one of their number succeed in that direction. The century of military government, but particularly the last seven years, has also left Spain with an acute financial problem in the shape of an enormous public debt, and with an economic problem arising from the overdevelopment of a few favored industries at the expense of the general welfare of the country. This economic situation has lately resulted in a serious shortage of food, if not actual starvation, in many parts of Spain, and this in turn has been directly responsible for the marked increase in revolutionary agitation of the last few months. Should the monarchy be toppled over in the present crisis, anarchy might well be the result, at least for a considerable period. Yet to preserve the monarchy as it stands today would be but to keep alive the anachronistic and medieval system that has brought Spain to the pass in which it now finds itself.

The Spanish monarchy has always been feeble, whether under the Hapsburgs, the House of Savoy, or the Bourbons, since the defeat of the Armada in 1588 and the decline of the once widespread empire. English and Dutch intervention saved it in the seventeenth century. The Bourbons in the following century managed through despotic means to prevent it from going under. Early in the nineteenth century Spain and its rulers were ever and again at the mercy of Napoleonic France, and through the latter part of the century only military rule, supported by the Catholic church, whose clergy lulled the population into amenable docility, held up the throne in Spain, despite the abortive revolution of 1820 and the twenty-three months of republican government in 1873-74. After the World War, however, the population, or a goodly part of it, threw off its habitual indifference. The general elections of 1920 smashed the two-party system by means of which the government had been arbitrarily rotated between the Conservatives and Liberals. There followed a period of makeshift governments, the Primo de Rivera dictatorship, the various attempts to overthrow the dictator (one of which was with the secret connivance of King Alfonso, who himself had arranged the coup d'etat that brought Primo de Rivera into power), and, finally, the shelving of Primo de Rivera and the present futile experiment with Berenguer.

It was during this last period (when Alfonso substituted dictatorial for make-believe parliamentary rule as promising more effective protection for his throne) that Spain's difficulties passed from the chronic to the acute stage. Under the dictatorship a tremendous debt was permitted to accumulate, an unhealthy industrial development took place (behind the highest tariff walls in Europe), the Catholic church strengthened itself by seizing control of secondary education, civil liberties were almost wholly abolished, and a feeling of distrust and political insecurity spread over the country. The resultant dissatisfaction undermined military morale and gave strength to the republicans; the growing economic difficulties made the workers restless and led to the expansion of syndicalist and Communist activities; and the political chaos encouraged the separatists of Catalonia and the autonomists of the Basque provinces. Thus the monarch brought Spain to its present crisis in his effort to save the monarchy. Both of his dictators have failed, he can no longer count on the army, and the clergy has in effect withdrawn its support, fearful lest a political collapse might also result disastrously for the church. Only the many quarrels dividing the various factions seeking the king's power have kept Alfonso on his throne. Nevertheless, any small accident may in the present circumstances unseat him. Then will probably come the long-delayed and much-needed revolution. Whether it leads first to a period of anarchy or temporarily to Socialist or Communist rule is of small moment as history goes. What is essential is that the revolution should rid Spain of the medieval system that has kept it among the so-called backward nations.

A Life for a Life

MORE than 350 homicides in New York City in 1930 resulted in not one execution. Thus is the capital-punishment law in process of nullifying itself, not only in New York but all over the country. Grand juries refuse to indict for first-degree murder; trial juries time after time will not convict for the same charge, with the electric chair as an outcome. Men who actually get as far as the death house at Sing Sing wait months and even years, living through appeal after appeal and reprieve after reprieve, as if the state itself were reluctant to insist on this particular application of the letter of the Mosaic law.

A select committee on capital punishment in Great Britain has just issued a report urging a suspension of hangings for a period of five years, to test the punishment of murderers by other means than legal murder. The committee also urges the House of Commons to authorize commutation to life imprisonment of the sentences of all persons already sentenced to death and awaiting execution. The committee feels most strongly that such a step would not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"endanger life or property or impair the social security of the country," and adds:

> Year by year the death penalty has been withdrawing itself from the public gaze. The death bell is no longer tolled, the black flag is no longer raised. If we take away the scaffold as well, it is because we feel that it is not needed in this new day of social building. We can build better without it.

This action recommended for Britain is but another indication that the proponents of capital punishment are finding themselves more and more on the defensive. In a recent issue of *Current History* appear two articles on the subject: the first, in favor of the death penalty, by Judge Marcus Kavanagh of Illinois; the second, urging the abolition of capital punishment, by the warden of Sing Sing prison. Judge Kavanagh wishes to keep the death penalty because it prevents murder. To prove his point he adduces figures which seem superficially to show that when the death penalty has been revoked murders have increased and that in the States where it no longer exists the population is so agricultural and so scattered that nobody is disposed to commit murder there anyway. Moreover he declares that in States adjacent to these, where capital punishment is still in effect, the homicide rate is smaller per unit of the population, although the character of the population is substantially the same.

Warden Lawes, with the same country to examine and presumably the same figures to prove his point, demonstrates the exact opposite of Judge Kavanagh's contentions. Answering the Judge point for point he shows that in the eight States which have definitely abolished the death penalty the homicide rate has not appreciably increased, that there has been no definite abatement of murder in the forty States that retain capital punishment, and that neither the imposition of the death sentence nor consequent executions have been followed by a marked falling off of the homicide rate. In Kansas there is no capital punishment; in Missouri there is. Kansas City, Kansas, had a homicide rate in 1929 of 15.2 per 100,000 of population; Kansas City, Missouri, just across the river, had a rate of 24.8. The homicide rate in Montana, where the death penalty still obtains, was 5.2 in 1927; in the adjacent State of North Dakota, where it has been abolished, the rate was 1.7. In 1929 Milwaukee, Wisconsin, with a population of over 500,000, and no death penalty, had 17 murders; Minneapolis, Minnesota, with no death penalty, and with a population of 455,000, had in the same year 10 murders. Buffalo, New York, where capital punishment still exists, with a population of 500,000, had 31 murders in 1929.

The answer to our shockingly high homicide rate, compared with almost any other country in the world, is to be found, not in the imposition of the death penalty, but in prompt and effective law enforcement without it. The theatrical atmosphere which now surrounds our trials for murder with death at the end of them precludes an unprejudiced consideration of the case and allows for innumerable delays and evasions. The murderer now knows that there is a good chance he may never see the inside of a courtroom; if he does, there is a far better chance that he will leave it a free man. Murder, he is justified in concluding, is one of the best rackets in America today.

In Defense of Weather

As the year 1930 draws to its unlamented close, we feel strongly that something ought to be said in defense of its weather. The whole year through, it has been the subject of well-nigh universal reprobation. Either it was too hot or too cold, too wet or too dry, too windy or too breathlessly still—always too something. In fact we cannot recall having heard a good word for the weather since the stock market crashed fourteen long months ago. It seems to have no more friends than the Hoover Administration in the Senate.

Now this, we hold, is thoroughly unjust. To begin with, the weather can't help it. Like a mongrel dog, which it is not like, the weather is what it is. What right-minded man will blame it for that? And more than that, it has many amiable characteristics. It never answers back. We have heard thousands of people curse the weather; we have never known it to say a word in reply. And we respect the weather, too, because, like a cat, it does what it pleases, and not what we please or what Secretary Mellon pleases. And because it never pleases to do the same thing twice, the weather, unlike many of our pet aversions, is interesting. Note the alternative. Southern California has no weather. The wretched inhabitants have had to invent climate to take its place. Hence, instead of denouncing the weather which they do not have, they are driven to a universal and unanimous praise of their climate, just as ill-mannered parents praise the virtues of their bad baby. Let no one complain of the weather until he has suffered from the virtues of climate. Then he will not want to complain.

It is all very well, the critics reply, to defend the weather in general; their complaint is against the weather of 1930 in particular. But James H. Scarr, forecaster for New York, who keeps the weather up on top of the Whitehall Building where the public cannot feed or annoy it, has just shown the hollowness of their complaints. Nineteen thirty broke more weather records, he points out, than any other year in history. Now we may be out of a job, and we may refuse to pass the international copyright law; but every American bosom will swell with pride in recalling that 1930 gave us the hottest February 19, 20, 21, 24, and 25 on record, that April gave us four record cold days, that May broke the records for both cold and heat, and that August 23 eclipsed all previous performances with 2.73 inches of rain in thirty minutes—and so on from one peak of glory to another. Is all this nothing? we ask. What more will any loyal American demand? Just to be comfortable, say some mean-spirited citizens, in whose blood will doubtless be found an alien taint only half a dozen generations back. But the full truth crushes even them to earth. With all its records, Mr. Scarr shows, 1930 was a good normal year. If you were too hot on January 8 and too cold on November 28, on the average you were very comfortable, even if you didn't know it.

But, demand the critics, do you simply defend an order that has made no progress since the days of Washington and Jefferson? Have you no constructive suggestions? We have—a very simple one: Let those who do not like our weather go back each and every one where he came from. Then our weather will be perfectly satisfactory.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Hope for Disarmament?

By W. T. STONE

SHOULD the world call a "disarmament" holiday? When the Council of the League of Nations meets in January it will have before it the draft disarmament treaty hopefully submitted by the Preparatory Commission as a working text for the first General Disarmament Conference. The Council, which has been waiting for this text for almost five years, will be asked to set a definite date for the conference. November, 1931, and February or March, 1932, have been proposed. In reaching its decision the Council will presumably be guided by the resolutions of the Assembly, which at its September meeting urged the dangers of delay. But the Council might also seriously consider whether the best interests of peace will not be better served by a ban, at least temporary, on further disarmament conferences.

The suggestion need not be lightly dismissed. Disarmament conferences can be breeders of trouble as well as contributors to peace. The Washington conference has been generally set down as a success; on the whole it accomplished more good than harm. Yet it undoubtedly sowed seeds of discontent which bore fruit in the Franco-Italian and the Anglo-American "parity" disputes. The Geneva naval conference of 1927 left little but injured feelings in its wake. The London conference was directly responsible for increasing the tension between France and Italy to a point where compromise has become, for psychological reasons, impossible.

This does not mean that the disarmament efforts of the past ten years should be decried. Far from it. These efforts have been essential, and form an integral part of the larger movement whose end is the replacing of international anarchy by some semblance of international organization. But the results of these three major conferences do show that there are dangers which should be taken into account. The disarmament conferences held so far have all been relatively small affairs: five Powers at Washington; three Powers at Geneva; five Powers again at London. The results, good and bad, were limited. The General Disarmament Conference is expected to bring together some fifty-odd Powers, every important state in the civilized world. The effects of its action will be world-wide.

"Failure," said Jonkheer Loudon, the Netherlands delegate and former chairman of the Preparatory Commission, in referring to the general conference, "would be disaster." Most of his colleagues on the commission were inclined to agree with him. M. Politis, the Greek delegate, speaking at the final session, foresaw the end of civilization in war if the armaments race was renewed.

What are the prospects for success held forth by the draft treaty? The text itself holds little promise. In the first place, it deals only with *methods* of limitation. It leaves to the final conference the fixing of figures and ratios of strength. And even on questions of method it is not an agreed text, but a series of recommendations passed on by majority vote of government agents who had no power to prejudice the position of their respective states at the conference. One may sympathize with the reasons for this unusual procedure. Unanimous agreement could not have been reached in ten years at the rate the commission was proceeding. Arms and expenditures on arms increased while the commission—a body of civil servants—talked. What choice but to turn in a majority report and adjourn?

The first three chapters of this draft treaty lay down the methods of limitation. Chapter I deals with effectives, that is, the personnel of land, naval, and air forces. Effectives are to be limited. Officers are to be limited separately in the case of armies, but not in the case of navies and air forces. Countries with the conscription system are to limit the period of service, which is not to exceed a maximum to be agreed upon.

Chapter II deals with methods of limiting material. Land material (guns, tanks, and munitions) is to be limited indirectly, by fixing expenditures; naval material by applying the provisions of the London treaty, with modifications, to the smaller countries; air material by limiting the numbers and total horse-power of airplanes and dirigibles in service in the armed forces.

Chapter III covers budgetary limitation. The total annual expenditure on land, sea, and air forces is to be limited, and as far as possible reduced. (A committee of experts is to draw up a model table showing how this can be done.)

Chapter IV prohibits the use of poison gas and bacteria in time of war. (This has been prohibited before, but for some reason the conventions have never been ratified.)

Chapter V is the most useful in the draft treaty. It proposes, with the concurrence of almost every state, valuable machinery for execution of the treaty. A Permanent Disarmament Commission is to be set up at the seat of the League of Nations. It is to be composed of experts appointed by non-members as well as members of the League and is to meet at least once a year. It will hear complaints of violations and receive statistical information from the governments showing the strength of their respective armed forces and their expenditures on national defense. And it will submit reports at least once a year, or more often if necessary. This much, at any rate, marks a distinct advance. In addition, however, Chapter V provides an "escape clause" and reaffirms the sanctity of previous treaties, including of course that of Versailles.

Now if this reflected the unanimous recommendations of the Powers the draft treaty might afford a timid beginning to the continuous process of disarmament. No one expects miracles, especially in disarmament. Even technical differences would not be serious. But unfortunately the differences are not technical. They are fundamental. The list of dissenting nations is significant. It is headed by Germany, disarmed at Versailles. It includes Hungary and Bulgaria, the other disarmed Powers on the commission, and Soviet Russia, whose plan for immediate disarmament was summarily rejected four years ago. Since the London conference the dissenters have been joined on several vital points by Italy. There are many others. No state, in fact, has given the draft its complete approval. But it is the formidable bloc composed of those states which are dissatisfied with the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

existing status in Europe which holds significance for the future.

Germany takes exception to much that is in the text and much more that is left out. With Russia, Norway, Sweden, Holland, and China she protests the failure to limit trained reserves, the strength of conscript armies. With Russia and nine other countries Germany objects to the failure to limit land war materials and munitions directly, as her own are limited. With eight others she declines to accept indirect limitation of war material, except as a supplement to direct control. She takes exception to the failure to limit airplanes in reserve, war supplies in reserve, and the failure to include exchange of information regarding certain war materials. To these and to many other omissions Germany, Russia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and some others are unwilling to subscribe. It matters little that on the final reading of the draft treaty some of the objections were dropped. They were dropped, by the method of abstention from vote, solely for the purpose of bringing an end to the work of the Preparatory Commission.

Most members of the commission agreed with our own Mr. Gibson that their draft offers "little hope of reduction." Some would say none. What it suggests is a convention on the lines of the London naval treaty, which fixes maximum limits at approximately existing levels, beyond which the parties agree not to go. This, it is argued even by such as Lord Cecil, is the best that can be done at the present time. It should be accepted as the first step.

The assumption of Lord Cecil, undoubtedly as sincere an advocate of disarmament as there is among statesmen, is that the first step will be accepted. Under protest, perhaps, but in the end accepted. But is there any sound basis for this hope? What reason is there for believing that states will accept at a final conference that which they have consistently rejected for five years in the Preparatory Commission? On the contrary, Germany could afford to "be patient" during the commission's debate, which lacked finality; she could hardly continue to "be patient" at the final conference—and for very obvious reasons. The effect of stabilizing armaments at their present levels would be simply to legalize existing inequalities and to pull even tighter the noose in which Germany was forced to place her neck at Versailles. The hard facts all point to Germany's refusal to put her head in the noose again. Moreover, unless some reduction can be promised, Germany is altogether likely to repudiate the disarmament provisions included in the Treaty of Versailles.

There are other storm signals on the horizon, too numerous to set down here, which are clearly to be seen in the shifting political balance and the existing state of tension in Europe. In the face of this situation, it is folly to ignore the possibility—no, the probability—of failure. It is equally absurd to ignore the repercussions which failure would have, not only on the future of disarmament, but on the continued existence of peace. It would be far better to call a halt on what can only be a pretense at disarmament than to invite inevitable disaster.

There is only one alternative. The fifty-odd Powers which are expected to participate in this conference have about twelve months to study the draft treaty, to examine the state of the world, and to decide what to do. Concessions might yet make another conference worth holding. But who is to make the concessions? No nation is lacking in good and sufficient reasons for declining to recede. Germany's legal case, based on Article VIII of the Covenant and the preamble to Part V of the Treaty of Versailles, is well fortified. So is the French case. M. Tardieu, in a speech on November 13, summed up that case when he denied that the treaty had imposed on the ex-Allies an obligation to disarm at the same time as Germany. It obliged Germany to disarm first, and that essential prerequisite, according to France, has yet to be carried out. There is legal support also for the case of every other Power, not excluding the United States.

The United States, acknowledged the most powerful nation in the world, is pleased to regard itself as a peace-loving nation. It has pointed with pride on occasion to its own contribution to disarmament at Washington, and has also on occasion told the rest of the world how to behave. The rest of the world has received the advice in good grace but sometimes it has smiled. The United States has been a member of the Preparatory Commission since it was set up in May, 1926. It has been represented from the beginning by Hugh S. Gibson, career diplomat and now Ambassador to Belgium. Votes were not always counted in the meetings of the Preparatory Commission, so it is impossible to say just how Mr. Gibson stood on the vital points of the agenda. But the records reveal that it was Mr. Gibson who first suggested, in April, 1929, the method of reaching agreement by deferring to the views of the majority. The question at issue was whether or not to limit trained reserves. The "majority" was represented by France and her allies, and trained reserves were excluded.

The United States, by abstaining from voting, has given its tacit approval to most of the omissions protested by Germany and others. In addition it has flatly declined to recommend any reduction in the size of future battleships, insisting on the 35,000-ton limit set at the Washington conference ten years ago, and it has refused to accept the proposed method of budgetary limitation of armaments under any consideration.

The position of the United States on budgetary limitation is especially illuminating. When this proposal was made about three years ago, Mr. Gibson rose to explain the reasons for his country's position. He declared that the plan was "unfair" to countries with a high standard of living, where both wages and costs of war materials were higher, and that budgetary limitation was "impracticable, inequitable, and hence inadmissible."

The justice of this American opposition was admitted and it was subsequently proposed not to compare one country's budget with that of another, but with its own preceding budget. The value of this method as an additional check on competition was emphasized at the recent session of the commission. It was pointed out that with regard to naval armaments competition in expenditure might be just as dangerous as competition in numbers. The only way to stop this competition is by preventing unlimited expenditure. Mr. Gibson, however, on instructions from Washington, but without further explanation, reiterated the inability of the United States to accept any budgetary limitation for itself. As a result of this decision Great Britain, France, and Japan served notice that they would be unable to limit naval expenditure unless all other naval Powers accepted a similar obligation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the end, moreover, the United States was the only country which would not accept budgetary limitation under any consideration.

What is the explanation of the American position on this important point? One explanation is fairly obvious. For the past five or six years we have been spending between $30,000,000 and $50,000,000 a year on new naval construction. If we are to build up to the limits of the London treaty, even spreading the program over a ten-year period, annual appropriations for new construction will rise to $150,000,000. The position of this country is scarcely immune from criticism. If concessions cannot be made by the United States, can they well be expected from nations in a less favorable position?

Uncle Andy and His Tax Refunds

By PAUL Y. ANDERSON

Washington, December 20

NO one in recent years has performed a more devastating operation than was conducted this week on the saintly Mr. Mellon by the unsaintly but extremely thorough Mr. John Garner of Texas, who for years has questioned the Treasury tax refunds. In a public statement and also in his annual report for 1930 the imperious Secretary of the Treasury took exception to Mr. Garner's remarks concerning tax refunds, and made the following statement:

> During the past fourteen years the total amount of additional assessments resulting from office audits and field investigations has been $5,345,202,277, while the amount paid out in refunds during the same period has been $1,254,317,890. During that period the total internal-revenue receipts have been $44,032,371,357, so that the amount refunded has been only approximately 2.8 per cent of the amount collected.

But the gentleman from Texas, instead of accepting the impressive figures of Mr. Mellon, insisted on dissecting them. Mr. Garner disclosed first that in making up his total of receipts the ingenuous Secretary had included not merely the income, excess-profits, and estate taxes, on which virtually all refunds apply, but also had included the war-time "nuisance taxes," such as those on theater and baseball admissions, automobiles and accessories, tennis rackets, mah-jongg sets, liquor and tobacco, toilet articles, cosmetics, chewing gum, and candy. Actually, the amount of income, excess-profits, and estate taxes collected in that period was less than $33,000,000,000. Next, he disclosed that of the five billion in additional assessments so proudly exhibited by Uncle Andy, more than a billion was assessed under the last five years of the Wilson Administration. Finally, he disclosed that the sum given by Mr. Mellon as "total refunds" *included only actual cash refunds, and entirely omitted credits and abatements, which amount to the same thing.* The total credits and abatements during Mellon's nine-year tenure have been $2,252,042,000! Under his administration collections in the form of income, excess-profits, and estate taxes have been approximately $19,000,000,000, and during the same period he has turned back in refunds, credits, and abatements more than $3,000,000,000. His generosity reached its peak in the grand and prosperous year of 1926, when the total refunded amounted to 32.8 per cent of total collections from those sources. The available evidence indicates that a large percentage of the taxes thus handed back were paid originally on war-time profits before Mellon entered the Cabinet.

IT must now be obvious to all persons above the mental age of ten years that the Hoover Administration has no program for dealing with unemployment and no information on which an adequate program might be based. Enactment of the Wagner bills would have gone a long way toward filling these needs, but it is doubtful whether the result would have been any different. This Administration simply lacks the backbone to undertake such a program if it had one. Strenuous efforts are being made to obscure the situation. The most spectacular of these efforts, in my opinion, was the President's gratuitous and unprovoked attack on the Senate. Inexperienced as he is in dealing with legislative bodies, he certainly knew that his charge of "raiding the Treasury" and "playing politics with human misery" would kindle a fire. Apparently he hoped it would produce enough smoke to hide the weaknesses of his own position. The hollowness of the charge itself is evident. Consider, for example, the transparent device of adding together the figures contained in pending bills and holding up the abhorrent total of $4,500,000,000 as proof of "Congressional extravagance." Every page boy in the House and Senate knows there never was a time in the last decade when a similar total could not have been produced in the same way. Everyone with the thinking capacity of a cherrystone clam is aware of the political considerations which cause Congressmen at every session to introduce scores of such bills without the slightest thought that any of them will be passed, or even considered. If there was any immediate evidence of an intent to "raid the Treasury" it was contained in the Senate bills for drought relief and public construction. Between the amount recommended by Mr. Hoover for those purposes and the amount voted by the Senate the difference was $3,000,000, which is equivalent to the weekly total of tax refunds, credits, and abatements made under Uncle Andrew Mellon! No, the Great Sufferer was worried, but not, I think, over "Congressional extravagance." I think he was worried lest someone call attention to the delectable circumstance that the President of the United States was providing about the same number of new jobs through public works as had been provided by his defeated rival, Al Smith, acting as a private contractor in New York City.

* * * * *

INCREDIBLE as it seems to one on the ground, his blank cartridge has been taken seriously by most of the newspaper editors of the country. At least, most of them pretend to take it so, for "solemn warnings" and "stern

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

admonitions" fill their pages, and the Senate is almost buried under the avalanche of abuse, nearly all of which discloses a marvelous ignorance of the facts or a magnificent capacity to ignore them. Editors are constantly lamenting the fact that newspapers have lost most of their influence. It is notorious that a host of men are reelected to office term after term in the face of unanimous newspaper opposition. Deriving a living from the press, and entertaining some sentiment toward it, I regret its waning power over public opinion, but only an unobservant man could fail to see the reason. Instances where public men have been able to go direct to the voters and make out clear cases of misrepresentation against the press have been so common that the public comes more and more to distrust not only the editorial judgments of the papers, but also their news columns. The next time a metropolitan newspaper editor pauses to ponder this distrust, let him consult his back files covering events of the past ten days in Washington.

* * * * *

IF any doubt existed as to whether "Old Bob" La Follette left a worthy successor to carry on his work in the Senate, the opening weeks of this session have sufficed to dispel it. During the past ten days "Young Bob" has reduced the Republican leaders of that body to a state of embarrassment and confusion that borders on the pitiful. He has put them in a position where they must either vote to rebuke their beloved President or go on record as favoring the "interests of wealthy taxpayers" as against the "relief of human suffering." He has compelled the Administration to reveal its lack of information concerning unemployment, and he has conducted a merciless exposure of the cowardly excuse that "the Red Cross is able to take care of those in distress." While this brilliant thirty-five-year-old statesman was shredding the trashy pretenses of the Administration and forcing it at least to contemplate the problem before it, Uncle George Norris has been hammering steadily toward victory on Muscle Shoals. It is too soon to say he will win at this session, but this much may be said: unless the bill passes soon, and with it that other Norris measure providing for submission of the "lame-duck amendment," the prospect is for an extra session of the new Congress—when both will certainly pass. Either before or shortly after the holidays there will be a conference of Progressives, after which their program will be more definitely known. They are in no humor to recede.

* * * * *

OVER in the House the Democrats, heartened by election results, have suddenly come to life with an apparent determination to assume the functions of an authentic and active opposition—so cravenly abdicated by their conservative party colleagues in the Senate. On the drought-relief bill the Longworth-Tilson-Snell dictatorship was out-maneuvered for the first time in its tyrannical career, and its high-handed attempt to jam through the $30,000,000 House authorization without giving members an opportunity to vote on the $60,000,000 Senate fund ended in an ignominious licking for Mr. Hoover's henchmen. Only by putting lame ducks to the torture and assuring Western members that the figures would be substantially increased in conference were the two-penny czars of the lowest House able to avert a stampede. Garner of Texas, McDuffie of Alabama, and Jones of Texas have demonstrated that they can match wits and fighting tactics with Longworth, Tilson, and Snell any time. But one marvels why they do not become more active in the matter of Muscle Shoals. Meantime, Republican ranks in the House are seething with mutiny. More than fifty lost their seats in the last election, and another fifty scraped through with majorities of less than a thousand. They are tasting the fruits of having blindly supported policies that were unpopular, and they are bursting with resentment against the leaders who dragooned them into that suicidal course. The right leader could rally them. Ramseyer of Iowa is the man, if he would overcome his natural caution sufficiently to act. Revolt they will; if not at this session, then at the next.

* * * * *

THE jolly junta of Raskob, Baruch, and Shouse, which is bent on eliminating Governor Roosevelt in favor of Owen D. Young for the Democratic Presidential nomination, is continuing its harmless campaign in this vicinity to "line up the Southerners." It has been joined by the ebullient Mr. Herbert Bayard Swope, which suggests that one of its next moves may be to purchase or start a newspaper. This would be a pleasant development, and wholly devoid of threat, for while Mr. Swope has demonstrated that he can run a newspaper and be tremendously entertaining he has never nominated or elected any Presidents. The idea that he or anyone else could nominate and elect Mr. Young on the Democratic ticket as long as Republican campaign orators have access to the records of the power and radio investigations conducted by the Federal Trade Commission and the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce will cause no agitation among practical political thinkers. At the same time nobody can object if they choose to use their money that way. According to all slogan-makers and some economists, what this country needs is more free spenders.

Coach Window

By SELDEN RODMAN

Beautiful slim trees in the slim forest
standing erect by the coals of a dark embankment
where swift trains hurl themselves with terrific abandon
into the tunnels of night;
slim trees in the slim forest, whipped
by the wind and the rain and the leaves playful:
birds singing a few
and some smoke;
trees in the forest where autumn always is
and the ground is matted with dying leaves, and the birds
no longer shatter the sky with their thin sharp notes;
will you remain,
marking the way to the city where tracks leap high
and men build their own tall forests branchless and bare,
or shrivel away
to render the last faint heat
when the stars are near and all things become alike,
when death is an accurate calculation
and the lean ice pulls?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Yellow-Dog Injunction

By JOEL I. SEIDMAN

THE yellow-dog contract, with the injunction which may be invoked to enforce it, constitutes the most oppressive device that employers, with the assistance of the courts, have so far discovered in their fight against organized labor. For that reason, leaders in the labor movement, as well as liberal opinion throughout the country, are vitally interested in the passage of Senator Norris's anti-injunction bill, which also curbs the yellow-dog contract.

Agreements not to join a union first came into general use in this country about fifty years ago. These non-union contracts, or "ironclads" as they were often called, aroused a feeling of bitterness among workers and antagonized the enlightened public opinion of the day to such an extent that a series of legislative attempts were made to outlaw this new weapon of unscrupulous employers. The method adopted by opponents of the anti-union contract was to work for laws making it a criminal act to force employees to sign such agreements, and such laws were passed in rapid succession by more than a dozen States. The Congress of the United States passed a similar regulation with respect to carriers engaged in interstate commerce.

This federal act, passed in 1898, was the first to receive the attention of the courts. The act provided

> . . . that any employer subject to the provisions of this act . . . who shall require any employee . . . to enter into an agreement, either written or verbal, not to become or remain a member of any labor corporation, association, or organization; or shall threaten any employee with the loss of employment, or shall unjustly discriminate against any employee because of his membership . . . is hereby declared to be guilty of a misdemeanor, to be punished as provided in the act.

A case arose in which an official of a railroad company discharged an employee because of his membership in a labor organization. Action was brought against the offending official under the Erdman Act, as the federal law was called, and the defense challenged the constitutionality of the act.

The case, known as Adair *vs.* United States, was fought through the federal courts and was finally decided in 1908 by the United States Supreme Court. The court held that the provision relating to discharge was a violation of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution, which declares that no person shall be deprived of liberty or property without due process of law, since it would compel an employer to accept or retain the personal services of another against his will. The court was careful, however, to restrict the decision to the provision relating to discharge, and to express no opinion as to the remainder of the law. The section of the Erdman Act making it criminal to force employees to sign anti-union agreements therefore remained intact.

The Adair case is of the greatest importance in the history of legislative attempts to outlaw the yellow-dog contract, for when cases arose under one of these laws, the Supreme Court held that in view of the Adair decision it had no choice but to declare such statutes likewise unconstitutional. Such a decision was handed down in 1915 in the celebrated case of Coppage *vs.* Kansas.

> In Adair *vs.* United States [the court said] this court had to deal with a question not distinguishable in principle from the one now presented. . . . Under constitutional freedom of contract, whatever either party has the right to treat as sufficient ground for terminating the employment, where there is no stipulation on the subject, he has the right to provide against by insisting that a stipulation respecting it shall be a *sine qua non* of the inception of the employment, or of its continuance if it be terminable at will.

In thus arguing that because an employee could be discharged for joining a union he could be forced to agree not to join one, the court used a process of reasoning that is open to considerable question. If, in an employment at will, a man can be discharged upon any ground or upon no ground at all, it would follow that there are no limits to the promises that might be exacted from an employee. Yet this is obviously not so, as Justice Day pointed out in his dissenting opinion, for no court would recognize an agreement that deprived a man of his life or freedom.

These decisions, however, did not unduly disturb the labor movement, which was made up of practical men who put more trust in economic strength than in legal enactment and had little fear of laws that could easily be evaded. Besides, it did not regard promises not to join a union as very serious obstacles. The only effect of the agreements, as the labor unions saw it, was psychological, the employers' hope being that the men who signed them would be either too honest or too timid to break their word. The unions, therefore, paid little attention to them and continued to send organizers into the forbidden territory.

The situation was completely altered, however, by the Hitchman decision, handed down by the United States Supreme Court on December 10, 1917. The Hitchman Coal and Coke Company made every employee pledge "that I am not a member of the United Mine Workers of America and will not become so while an employee of the Hitchman Coal and Coke Company . . . If at any time . . . I want to become connected with the United Mine Workers of America or any affiliated organization I agree to withdraw from the employment of said company." The Supreme Court held in its now famous decision that an injunction could be issued to restrain the union officials from seeking to persuade the Hitchman employees to violate these contracts.

Employers were not slow to realize that they possessed in the injunction a weapon of the greatest effectiveness. The Red Jacket case, upon which rests Judge Parker's claim to fame, strengthened the tendency to resort to these contracts, though it added nothing that was conclusive, since it went no higher than the United States Circuit Court of Appeals. As a result, the yellow-dog contract is resorted to at present, not so much for its psychological effect, as for its future usefulness in securing a court injunction against union organizers. Whenever an attempt is made to persuade the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

signers of these contracts to join a union, it can be accepted as a certainty that application will be made to a court of equity for a restraining order, and as just as great a certainty that the order will be issued.

This was true of the Kraemer Hosiery Mills of Nazareth, Pennsylvania, and of the United States Gypsum Corporation in Iowa, to cite but two of the most recent instances. In several instances, as in certain dressmaking establishments in New York City, the workers have been forced to deposit cash with the employer as security for observance of the yellow-dog contracts. In one case the helpless employees were even forced to agree that if they violated the terms by joining a union an injunction could be issued against them—which is much like forcing condemned men to say that they are willing to be executed. The use of yellow-dog contracts has spread so rapidly within the past thirteen years that now the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor estimates that 1,250,000 persons in this country are working under such agreements.

Clearly, labor is being combated here with a peculiarly deadly weapon. A man who has a family to support and no resources upon which he can fall back will of necessity sign anything to get a job. If, then, an injunction is issued and any attempt to acquaint him with the advantages of unionization becomes contempt subject to the summary punishment of the court, it follows that the growth of unionism can effectively be checked.

As a result, in the past five years a new effort has been made to curb the yellow-dog contract by means of legislative enactments that would avoid the pitfalls of unconstitutionality that the Supreme Court, whether its reasoning was faulty or not, held to exist in the Coppage case. The lead in this new movement was furnished by the Ohio State Federation of Labor, which in 1925 introduced into the legislature of that State a bill which declared the yellow-dog contract to be "contrary to public policy and wholly void." In an opinion the Attorney General of the State expressed the belief that the bill was constitutional, and though it failed of passage it attracted a considerable amount of attention and has formed the model for subsequent bills intended to remedy the same evil in other jurisdictions.

Thus far, Wisconsin has been the only State to pass legislation along these lines. The legislature passed a law in 1929, and a decision as to its constitutionality is expected shortly. Similar bills have been introduced in several other States, but they have met with no success.

The interest of all opponents of the yellow-dog contract is centered now in Senator Norris's anti-injunction bill, in which the Ohio provisions declaring the anti-union promise void and against public policy have been incorporated. The major question respecting this bill is whether, if passed by Congress, it will meet the test of constitutionality imposed by the Supreme Court. The first reaction of any informed person toward this question is apt to be pessimistic. Remembering that the Kansas statute was held unconstitutional in the Coppage case, one is likely to conclude that until the membership of the Supreme Court is considerably changed, a similar fate will await any legislative attempt to outlaw the yellow-dog contract. But the situation is not so hopeless as it seems. There is a vast difference between making the procuring of anti-union contracts a criminal act, as was done by the Kansas statute, and merely declaring such promises void as against public policy. Here there is, of course, ample ground for difference of opinion, but it is significant that the Ohio provisions, adopted by Senator Norris, were actually drafted by some of the most eminent legal authorities in the land, including leading members of the Harvard and Columbia law faculties, whose express mission it was to frame a bill that would be constitutional in view of the Adair and Coppage decisions. The bill thus drawn obviously does not involve the point of the Adair case, since no attempt is made to limit the employer's right of discharge.

Moreover, a great many things have happened since the Coppage case was decided fifteen years ago. The contracts have come into much wider use during the interval, with the result that the labor world has become thoroughly aroused to the danger they embody. The press of the country has roundly condemned the yellow-dog contract and the public conscience is aroused against it. More important still, the Senate refused to allow Judge Parker to sit upon the Supreme Court largely because he gave his support to the obnoxious contract. All this cannot fail to have its effect upon the court. In Coppage *vs.* Kansas the court said: "Laying aside . . . so much of the statute as indicates a purpose to repress coercive practices, what possible relation has the residue of the act to the public health, safety, morals, or general welfare? None is suggested, and we are unable to conceive of any." It is not likely, in view of recent developments, that the court would again use such language.

In addition, it is of considerable importance that the New York State courts, which next to the federal system enjoy the most prestige in the country, refuse to enforce the yellow-dog contract. In 1927 the Court of Appeals of New York, in the case of Exchange Bakery and Restaurant, Inc., *vs.* Rifkin, decided not to enforce the yellow-dog contract, since it was not a contract, but "merely a promise based upon no consideration." The following year, in the case of the Interborough Rapid Transit Company *vs.* Lavin, the court rendered a similar decision. No statute similar to the Ohio bill is therefore necessary in New York, since the yellow-dog contract is unenforceable at common law.

In the last analysis, as everyone familiar with labor decisions knows, social prejudice rather than legal analysis is the determining factor. If the majority on the Supreme Court disapprove of the act they will declare it unconstitutional, whereas if they approve of it they will find a way to uphold it, most likely as a valid exercise of the police power. In view of the court's record of conservatism, the statement that the bill has an even or almost even chance of being declared constitutional may come as a surprise. Upon the votes of Holmes and Brandeis we can of course rely. Hughes is almost certain to side with them, for he dissented in the Coppage case; and Stone has shown leanings toward liberal views. It requires but one more, and Roberts is as yet pretty much of an unknown quantity.

Once a federal law along the lines of the Norris bill is passed and upheld, the death knell of the yellow-dog contract will have been sounded, for the States are bound to follow, either by legislative enactment or judicial decision. Employers will still have the power to force their employees to sign anti-union contracts, but with the courts refusing to enforce them by injunctions they will not be worth the paper they are written on.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Going to School in Russia

By FERDINANDA W. REED

IN the District of Kaluga, which adjoins the southern boundary of the Moscow District, an important experiment in the field of education is being carried on—one of the most important of all the Soviet experiments. It is not new in the sense of having been begun since the revolution. It had its beginnings in 1905 when the idea of "environmental education" attracted the attention of leading authorities, and the Czar granted land for a colony in Kaluga for the working out of the principle of the child's participation in its social environment.

For centuries, in Russia's vast countryside, the poverty and isolation of the villages had bred ignorance and superstition in a darkness undisturbed by any ray of enlightenment from state or church. In many families literacy was unknown, in many villages there had never been a school. To such so-called "dark people" in Kaluga came a young man named Schatsky, and in that little colony he developed his work of relating the child's education to its environment and daily life.

When the Soviets took power twelve years ago, the leaders of the revolution saw in this colony soil already plowed and harrowed for the seed they wished to sow. The whole District of Kaluga, comprising an area nearly two and a half times as large as the State of Connecticut, was now included with the colony as the field of experiment; the direction of education in all its towns, villages, and hamlets was turned over to Dr. Schatsky and to his musician wife for an educational undertaking on a heroic scale.

The exhibit of the Kaluga schools which I attended showed the development of their work in a series of posters and collections of small pictures and compositions drawn or written by the children themselves, with photographs and snapshots, arranged according to subjects. These latter may show a house in one of the villages of "dark" people, or some building on a deserted estate, that has been taken over for a school. To American eyes the building, whatever its purpose, appears primitive and rudimentary; as a possible school, it seems still more discouraging. What goes on in that building is a different matter.

When the children first assemble, the teacher does not begin sorting them into classes and apportioning books. It is not at first the teacher's business to teach. It is her business, as one cognizant of the government's various projects for cultural and economic development and as an active participant in the Gosplan (State Program), to acquaint herself with each child's home conditions, background, and surroundings, to the end that the school may deal with the conditions and supply through the child the cultural, social, and economic needs of the home. Whatever the children's ages they can neither read nor write. They come from families where perhaps to father and mother, uncles, cousins, and aunts the printed words of their own language are as undecipherable as Etruscan inscriptions. These children's hands receive for the first time contact with pencil and brush. "Draw a picture of what you did before you came to school this morning," says the teacher. And as once in the dawn of human imagination the cave men and women scratched their crude drawings on walls and rocks, so now these little children's emerging minds stir to expression. "Me, bringing in wood," "Me, feeding the hens," "Me, sweeping the steps", "Me, watering the cow," and others. Then, "Draw a picture of your house." "What does your father do? Does he till the land? Has he a plow? Draw a picture of his tools. His animals. Does he work in a factory? What does mother do? Tend the house? Take care of the baby? Work in a factory? Does she go to the political meetings?" Then, "What games do you like to play? What do you like to play best? What in winter? In summer?" By and by there are little compositions on family life, relations of children with parents, and relations of children to home work in the house and in the fields. The theme, "We must help mother because she can't do it all," brings out in pictures and in written words used for the first time the simple round of household tasks.

In this way the school comes to the aid of women. Through the child it instructs and helps her in the bringing up of children. Small posters for distribution show "Airing room before the child goes to bed," "Child sleeping with its hands outside the covers," "The child scolded at table, turning dejected from its food," "The child's own little corner with table and chair, for work or play," and many, many others. Posters and photographs show mothers' meetings, mothers bringing babies to school and older children caring for them, mothers—primitive, earthbound, enduring—sitting on the rough school benches listening to a little child reading a report.

When there is to be a meeting of the local Soviet the children write out in school the notices summoning the voters and announcing the matters for discussion, matters which in a village are likely to be familiar and comprehensible to even the youngest of the scribes. The inscription of official public documents is a responsibility not to be lightly undertaken. Only the most approved penmanship, the neatest and most shipshape appearance are to be adjudged worthy the service of the government. Then there is the prestige and importance of distributing the notices to the voters. The youngsters, of course, expect results from their elders. Such intimate pressure from the very hearthstone may confidently be counted on to get out the vote and to confine the number of stay-at-homes to the irreducible minimum.

In one village the well is polluted. Sickness affects families, friends, and neighbors. The children go with the teacher to the well, draw water, and bring it to the school. An expert comes from Moscow bringing apparatus. He analyzes the water before the children, illustrating the tests and magnifying glass, explaining to them the menace to a community of impure water, describing the dangers to health and the consequences of disease. He commands the attention of an audience already personally involved and in some instances painfully so. The children, instructed by the teacher as to form and order, then draw up a report setting forth the evils of the situation in their village and the necessity for a pure water supply. They vie with each other in calligraphy to produce

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the document most fitting the importance of the occasion, take the chosen copy and themselves present it to the local Soviet. The local Soviet, moved not only by motives of intimate concern, but by pressure from the children within their private and particular walls, and also by the desire to attract favorable attention from the watchful eye of Moscow, acts. The old well is abolished and a new one dug. The general health improves. Father can go to work again, the baby thrives. The budding young helmsmen have begun to steer the ship of state.

In some villages there has never been a post office. Now one corner of the village school becomes a regularly appointed official post office of the United Socialist Soviet Republics. The children, under the teacher's guidance, take charge. They conduct the business of receiving supplies from Moscow, and of selling stamps and collecting postage. Arithmetic and bookkeeping become vital parts of the training of those who are conducting public business. The children stamp the letters, send out, receive, and distribute the mail, give out government literature and posters pertaining to the agricultural and industrial conditions, the cultural and economic needs of their community. The village is no longer isolated; it has entered, with its own part to play, into the new life and forces of the nation, whose future public servants are getting their experience early.

Dr. Schatsky, in whose prolific mind these projects for relating the child's education to its environment and daily life find unending applications, seems to inspire teachers also to find fresh fields for the functioning of the school in the community. Schatsky himself, sturdy and benign, with a shock of gray hair rising above a ruddy countenance, perspiring even in winter, speaks of these village post offices with a twinkle of especial pride and satisfaction in his shrewd and kindly eyes.

In one village the fire engine has never been repaired since pre-revolution days. In spite of fire-prevention campaigns and instruction fire has continued to cause devastating loss and suffering to the villagers. The teacher sends for a skilled mechanic; the children, as they aid him in making repairs, learn its parts and workings and then give the old engine a fine coat of red paint. The next time a fire breaks out in a straw-thatched roof and homes are threatened, the engine, thanks to the young city fathers, saves the day.

Some villages depend for their livelihood on growing potatoes for the starch factory. Although a new kind of potato and improved methods of culture have been discovered that would greatly increase the starch content of the crop, lectures, descriptions, and all the efforts of the authorities have been unavailing in changing the old potato-growing habits of the peasants. At school the children receive new seed from Moscow; under the guidance of an expert agronomist they prepare ground beside the school where they plant and grow the improved potato. Under their elders' very eyes they raise a bumper crop of superior value. "That's all right for a school garden but it wouldn't work in the big fields," say the doubting Thomases. Next season, however, with the children's advice and help, they try out some little plots. So gratifying are the results that the next season the whole crop is grown according to the new methods. The family income shows a correspondingly gratifying increase and the young props of the community can go on to new fields.

A frieze around the walls of the large exhibit room was composed of pictures in colors by the children. Two-thirds of the pictures were painted by the pupils in the Kaluga schools and one-third by the pupils of a school in Moscow which is also under the direction and guidance of Dr. Schatsky. The work of the country children, whose eyes are accustomed to space, to large effects and contrasts of light and color, showed a fine boldness and simplicity in their landscapes—dark trees against a sunset sky, little house and green field, flowers, chickens, and cows composed against simple backgrounds. It contrasted sharply with the work of the city children, whose sense of detail was exemplified in representations of buildings with many windows, trolley cars, or sidewalks with houses.

Last November Dr. Schatsky received a signal distinction. Very small and paltry it might seem in countries accustomed to measuring outstanding executive ability, resourcefulness, and initiative by money value, but it was highly significant of the profound economic difference between our capitalistic competition and the socialistic cooperation of a country which looks to the eventual abolition of money. Fame and the opportunity in magnificent extent to work out the plans next his heart were already the portion of the man whom the nation wished to honor, and the present simple, frugal living he shares with all. So, as a token of the esteem in which his great services are held Dr. Schatsky was granted free transportation on all the street cars of Moscow. It means a saving of fifty cents a day, which is worth while when the highest Communist salary is only $112.50 a month.

"It is disconcerting, to say the least," said John Dewey in his account of education in Soviet Russia in the *New Republic* of December 12, 1928, "to find Russian schoolchildren much more democratically organized than are our own . . . and receiving a training that fits them more systematically . . . for later active participation in the self-direction of both local communities and industries."

A whole army of new teachers, with new vision, new resources, new contacts, is called into being by the new needs of Russia. All this experience of active citizenship, this training in initiative and enterprise, begets in growing children a spirit of adventure that develops as their horizons widen, and the struggle in Russia is permeated with romance. It may be that capitalism has more to fear from Russia's appeal to the idealism and altruism of youth than it has from her economic competition.

In the Driftway

MOST of the hurried human animals of this hurried generation hold fast to the memory of some quiet unpeopled corner of the earth in which they have at some precious period thrown off the responsibilities of a complicated life. Perhaps it is a grove of spruce or pine rising in lonely sunshine to a blue sky; perhaps it is the bank of a stream where a campfire, long since put out, once threw long shadows on a moonlit clearing; a snowbound cabin with smoke rising from fragrant logs; a strip of sand on an edge of lake; or a trail winding up and up to a frozen peak. To all who carry about with them the remembrance of such glamorous hours the Drifter recommends the latest good deed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the national Forest Service which for almost forty years has fought a hard and honorable fight to protect the public interest from private greed.

* * * * *

FOR many years, to promote the use of the forests by the public, the service invited and encouraged the building of hotels and roads and other attractions, with the result that last year 23,000,000 people used the national forests for purposes having to do with recreation. Now the problem is to protect the forests from too much use. As a solution, the Forest Service proposes to set aside three types of woodland, to be preserved forever in their present state as natural areas, experimental forests, and primitive areas. The first two types will be left completely untouched and kept for the study of scientists. The primitive areas will be given over to recreational use and will consist of large tracts of forest land that have never been materially altered by either human or natural forces. In these areas trails and low-grade roads will be built only to the extent necessary for fire protection and administration. There will be no automobile roads, no hotels, no permanent structures whatever. The forest look-out presumably will bring his canvas shelter back with him when the fall rains and the first snows bring an end to the fire season. Fifteen such areas with a total acreage of 1,750,000 have already been selected in California alone, and many others are to be set aside in Maine, in the region around Lake Superior, and in the Far West.

* * * * *

THE Drifter, for one, is filled with gratitude. The pressure of business-like tourists with their loud, malodorous motor cars, their orange peels, and their insistence on bathrooms has come to be as great a menace to our finest woods as any timber-slashing, fire-spreading fiend. Those who wish to look upon the highest snows and the greenest glacial meadows should at least pay the price of a journey on foot or by horse. It is good to know that a motor horn will never violate the slopes of Mount Olympus, that the few remaining forests of virgin pine will never be touched, that even to the hundredth generation the pack trail will be the sole and chastening approach to Sunrise Glacier.

* * * * *

AND all of this serves to remind the Drifter once more that the Forest Service is his favorite government department. Its fine record is too little known and much too scantily appreciated. The men who make that record draw no princely salaries to compensate them for a lonely life with its constant threat of hardship and even danger, or for the long and specialized training required. They must find compensation elsewhere, and doubtless they do in the health and satisfaction of living with trees—the Drifter has always considered trees the ideal substitute for human society. But the appreciation denied now will grow as generations pass. With each year the public grows more aware of the value of its woods and streams. The forest ranger in his gray-green uniform has already become a romantic figure, to take the place, with a difference, of the vanished frontiersman. In time he will come into his deserved esteem as the conscientious, intelligent, and trained protector of our watersheds, our timber supply, and our last place of refuge from an overpowering world.

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

A Farmer Speaks

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have been a subscriber to your esteemed publication for many years and have appreciated it very highly, but financial circumstances compel me to request that you discontinue my subscription.

I am unfortunate enough to be a farmer and we farmers are certainly getting it in the neck. Rye, which yielded 20 bushels, is worth 25 cents at the local elevator, which gives the gross return of $5 per acre; oats, with a yield of 45 bushels, now selling at 20 cents, will bring $9 per acre. I am beyond the allotted three score and ten years and have to hire all the work done, and so with interest, fertilizer, and the high taxes it costs me at least $15 an acre to raise, gather, and market a crop, not including depreciation or my supervision. If I were to hire all the teams and men the threshing and marketing alone would take about one-half of the returns.

But I hear the advice, "Diversify," ringing in my ears. We did raise a larger acreage of flax, which is an uncertain crop, and what happened? The price has dropped to one-half of what it was a year ago. And I venture to say that if we increase dairying, beef, swine, and sheep production from 10 to 15 per cent, those markets also will become glutted. So what is the farmer going to do?

Economic experts (?) of the Calvin Coolidge type advise the maintenance of high wages so as not to impair the purchasing power of the laborers, but it does not seem to dawn on them that so long as approximately 27,000,000 people living on the farms are without purchasing power, prosperity cannot be restored. Agriculture has been bled so long by organized and highly protected industry that it seems to be assumed that its blood supply is inexhaustible. But many farmers have already lost everything they have and a great many of those remaining are holding on by the skin of their teeth. Unless the present robber tariff which enables industry to exploit agriculture is wiped off the statute books, or agriculture is allowed to enjoy the same effective protection with a consequent home market, agriculture is doomed.

Wheaton, Minn., November 27 F. J. STEIDL

A Word of Protest from One of the Unemployed

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The number of commiserating editorials upon the issue of unemployment has been the stimulus to which readers have responded with a profusion of suggestions ranging from palliatives to panaceas. But whether it is a salve or a solution these gracious citizens offer, the one is about as worthless as the other.

As an irritated member of the unemployed now, and mindful of discomforts suffered during previous periods of enforced idleness, I would suggest that our dilemma might be more quickly resolved if many of the confused champions of our cause were to abandon us altogether. A sense of our own responsibility should be impressed upon us. We have always been too ready to leave to others the solution of problems that belong primarily to ourselves.

Millions of willing workers submitting abjectly to privation is a spectacle not uncommon in the industrial history of America,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

though the publicity attending the present instance is unusual. The prevailing universal distress should be an indictment of an economic system that must increasingly wreak misery upon millions of human beings. The jobless themselves should be among the first to denounce it instead of continuing to accept the banal propaganda designed to preserve forever the present order. Their apathy and inertia in the past are in part the reason of their being so absurdly helpless now when confronted with what seems the most acute panic that has ever occurred.

The right of the unemployed to complain of their lot belongs chiefly to those individuals among them who, instead of remaining servilely resigned to their degradation, have occasionally chosen to rebel. The rebellion may have been no more intelligent than the balking of a stubborn jackass; the ass, however, has never been noted for his willingness to be put upon and exploited to the limit, and then to bray to wolves for help.

The lack of comprehension among the unemployed as to the fundamental cause or possible cure of their unhappy predicament makes it extremely doubtful that they will think their way out, but at least, before it's too late, they might do well to emulate the ass, if not by a vigorous kick, then in some manner better calculated to cope with the ominous times ahead than blind trust in political saviors and the apple crop.

New York, December 1 WAYNE WALDEN

Judge Lindsey and the Bishop

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Judge Ben B. Lindsey should realize that intelligence is indeed a sorry ax with which to jump on tables and hack at crass stupidity in its more well-fed aspects. Its impotence as wielded in the skirmish with the Colorado chapter of the knights of the flaming cross should have taught the judge to cast about for a stouter weapon before entering upon "the good fight" with Bishop William T. Manning.

Worcester, Mass., December 9 OTIS C. FERGUSON

Stocks Are Preferable

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The statement that the Wickersham Commission is considering the practicability of flogging as a punishment and deterrent of crime is encouraging. But it seems to me that there are obvious objections to flogging, and that they become most cogent when that form of punishment is compared to others which would take us equally far back to first principles. Of these, the stocks are much to be preferred.

In the first place, flogging is not congenial to our culture. Whether we like it or not, we must face the fact that we have become squeamish and that good wholesome public floggings would simply raise an effeminate uproar. Juries would not convict.

But stocks! There is no device more adaptable to our modern tastes. As things are, there is plenty of interest aroused in criminals by the press, but it is almost impossible for the public to satiate its curiosity. The size and arrangement of courtrooms makes attendance on trials the privilege of a favored few, while such opportunity as there might be to get a glimpse of delinquent notables in corridors, at doorways, and on the street is spoiled by camera men, reporters, and officers ten deep.

This condition could be righted by exhibition of such persons in the stocks. A moderate admission fee could be charged. Who would not pay even as much as fifty cents, say, for the opportunity to look at one of our famous fiends fastened securely and in a good light? And the money could be used for unemployment relief, bonuses to policemen, and the expenses of Presidential commissions on law enforcement.

New York, December 1 J. G. CURTIS

The Farmers and Workers Pay

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The appropriation by Congress of $180,000,000 for depression and drought relief brought from President Hoover a strong protest—not that the $180,000,000 was more than was needed, but that "an increase in taxes in the end falls upon the workers and the farmers, or alternately deprives industry of that much ability to give employment."

To contend that the raising of $180,000,000 more through taxes or bond issues, for projects that would employ labor, would cripple private industry seems poor reasoning.

But when Mr. Hoover asserted that "no matter how devised, an increase in taxes in the end falls upon the workers and farmers," he said what is too generally true under a tariff system that confers monopoly privileges upon favored industrial groups. It helps to explain why 13 per cent of the people own 90 per cent of the wealth of the country.

Denver, December 10 F. S. KINDER

Help the Strikers

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the talk about business depression and unemployment there is danger that we shall lose sight of the fact that unemployment is being used to break down wage levels and such organization of labor as exists or is under way. Within the past week I have seen two situations illustrating my point.

In Danville, Virginia, 4,000 workers are in the twelfth week of a strike provoked by a wage cut in the Dan River cotton mills imposed by the employer, who then proceeded summarily to discharge his workers as fast as they joined the United Textile Workers Union. The strike has been singularly unanimous and, until recently, free from violence—the violence which brought troops to Danville was, by the way, greatly exaggerated. The strikers, men and women, have borne actual hunger with remarkable endurance. The leadership is good. But relief is inadequate, though American Federation of Labor unions are now giving help to their hard-pressed brothers. Men of good-will in and out of the labor movement simply cannot afford to let this strike be defeated by tear-gas bombs, hunger, and eviction.

In the West Virginia coal fields, smashing of the coal miners' union has not brought prosperity or employment to the miners. The reorganized United Mine Workers with headquarters at Springfield, Illinois, has handled one strike situation intelligently, though there is still need of relief. In the face of unemployment the working day, under the clean-up system, runs to nine, ten, and eleven hours. Wages have been forced down to about $3 a day and are paid largely in company script good only in company stores which charge from 15 to 50 per cent more than other stores.

The workers in West Virginia and in Danville cannot win their fight alone. The Emergency Committee for Strikers' Relief with headquarters at 112 East Nineteenth Street, New York, will transmit funds promptly in proportion to need.

New York, December 20 NORMAN THOMAS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books, Music, Drama

A Parting

By VIRGINIA MOORE

Farewell! and let the going be as clean
As frost that cuts the summer from the fall;
Let us be less than nothing who were all
And more to one another; let the lean
Shadow of rancor somberly intervene:
A parting should be unequivocal
As wormwood mingled with a cup of gall,
As apples that are puckery, strict, and green.

Believe that it is better, try the years,
Tutor your face to hold the anguish in,
Weep if you must but crouch where no one hears,
Hide from the blissful pair that we have been.
Lie to your heart if lies will comfort you.
My poor, poor love. I shall be lying too.

William Hazlitt

The Complete Works of William Hazlitt. Centenary Edition. Edited by P. P. Howe. Volumes I, IV, and V. London: J. M. Dent and Sons. Twenty-one Volumes. 15 guineas.

THE present edition of Hazlitt's works, commemorating his death in London just one hundred years ago, was greatly needed. The collected edition edited by Waller and Glover, published in 1902-6, comprising thirteen volumes, has been out of print and at a considerable premium for some years. It did not include the "Life of Napoleon," and of course not the two volumes of "New Writings" that the present diligent editor, Mr. P. P. Howe, has since unearthed. Though this centenary edition is based on that of Waller and Glover, it will come, with the addition of the two foregoing titles and the "English Grammar," to twenty-one volumes, with the text rearranged in a chronological sequence. The present three volumes, though admirably bound, seem in the main to be made from the original Glover and Waller plates. The type is somewhat small, old-fashioned, and, it must be confessed, rather dead-looking.

Dead-looking, that is, until one begins to read, for nothing could be more alive than these pages, than this tireless flood of eloquence, argument, aphorisms, distinctions, confessions, venom, enthusiasms. No writer of English has come nearer than Hazlitt to fulfilling his own ideal of a "familiar" style: "to write as anyone would speak in common conversation who had a thorough command and choice of words, or who could discourse with ease, force, and perspicuity, setting aside all pedantic and oratorical flourishes." For him the great horrible example was Dr. Johnson: it was as easy, he saw, to get upon stilts to tell your thoughts as it was to sink into slipshod phrases and slang: the difficult and delicate thing was to write as the ideal talker might speak. And Hazlitt's style is still so vibrantly alive not only because it is so natural, but because it is so intensely felt. His mind was not as profound or as subtle as Coleridge's, he lacked Lamb's humor and balance, but no other prose writer of his time wrote with his unflagging gusto.

His famous description of Montaigne, that he was "the first who had the courage to say as an author what he felt as a man," voiced the ideal that he unflinchingly set for his own writing. If his prose was vehement, it was because the man was vehement: his artistic and literary enthusiasms were vehement, his aversions were vehement, his political, even his metaphysical opinions were vehement; he painted vehemently, read vehemently, played rackets vehemently, saw prize fights vehemently, drank tea vehemently, and most unfortunately for himself, he loved vehemently. And he had to describe these things, fully, precisely as he felt them. "I could no more live without daring to speak, to look, to feel what I thought," he once wrote, "than I could hold in my breath for any length of time." And nearly all his writing, even his journalistic writing, reads as if he would burst if he tried to hold it in.

So intense a man is not always the most comfortable companion. He does not say yes or even remain silent when a friend expresses a judgment or an opinion with which he cannot agree: these things *matter* to him; he must argue the point, with an excitability that cannot always be polite. He quarreled at one time or another with all his friends, and broke off with most of them. He got a reputation for being very disagreeable. If you direct your candor against your acquaintances, you can hardly expect to remain popular with them; if you direct it against yourself, you give your enemies a weapon that they can use forever. And Hazlitt's enemies had no scruples on that score. They did not like it when he wrote bitter general truths, such as "If mankind had wished for what is right, they might have had it long ago"; or "We grow tired of everything but turning others into ridicule, and congratulating ourselves on their defects." But what they could never overlook was his public confession that he himself fell under the general rule:

> I don't know what it is that attaches me to H—— so much, except that he and I, whenever we meet, sit in judgment on another set of old friends, and "carve them as a dish fit for the gods." . . . We do not affect to condole or whine over their follies; we enjoy, we laugh at them till we are ready to burst our sides. . . . We serve up a course of anecdotes, traits, master-strokes of character, and cut and hack at them till we are weary.

But Hazlitt committed a crime far worse than this. In his loneliness it was his misfortune, at the age of forty-five, to fall furiously in love with his landlady's daughter, apparently a common slut. To win this girl he asked his wife, with whom he had not been living, to dissolve their loveless marriage. When he returned from Scotland, where the divorce was granted, he was confronted by the bitter knowledge that the girl had merely been amused as she was now frightened by him, and that she already had a lover, in the coarsest sense. That a man of Hazlitt's eminence should fall in love with a "servant girl" was incredible to any English gentleman, to any respectable friend; but that he should *write* about it, that he should set down every detail of it because he could not help himself, was unforgivable.

It is hardly necessary, at this late date, to defend Hazlitt's personal reputation. It is his critics—such as Wordsworth (whose illegitimate French daughter had not then been heard of), who declared that "the miscreant Hazlitt is not a proper person to be admitted into respectable society"—who have most to answer for. If there was one quality of which Hazlitt had not a single trace, it was hypocrisy. If there was one virtue he never lacked, it was moral courage. But Hazlitt has written his own best defense: "If there is haste or want of method, there is no commonplace, nor a line that licks the dust; and if I do not appear to more advantage, I at least appear such as I am."

I confess I cannot understand commentators who deplore the "Liber amoris" and profess to admire Hazlitt's criticism,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the complete and irrepressible candor that produced the first is precisely the quality that gives so much value to the second. He has been accused of being spiteful, and it is true that in his time he said many blistering things; but when we read them today, what mainly strikes us is not their sting, but how felicitously true they are. With amazingly few exceptions, his judgments of his contemporaries are those of posterity, and the chief thing that distinguishes them from ours is that they are written with an eagerness and a fierceness we can no longer muster. Though it is as an essayist that Hazlitt is still most read, his true greatness lies in his criticism. His "On Going a Journey," the favorite of all the essay anthologies, seems to me thin when compared with his magnificent estimate of, let us say, Coleridge.

Honesty and candor alone do not make a critic; he must have discrimination, knowledge, catholicity, independence; and Hazlitt had them all. He was a romantic and admired Rousseau, but the faults of the romanticists, of Wordsworth, Shelley, Rousseau himself, were pretty apparent to him, and he was able, as most of his fellow-romantics were not, to do justice to Dryden and Pope. He wrote about the Restoration dramatists like a civilized man, without the moral squeamishness of Macaulay or even the clever apologies of Lamb, and he never had any use for "those *do-me-good,* lackadaisical, whining, make-believe comedies in the next age."

The outward picture that we get of Hazlitt is that of a lonely and suffering man. We see him living in lodging-houses, getting up at one or two in the afternoon, drinking huge quantities of tea, writing his piece with the breakfast things still on the table, going to an inn for dinner, talking till early in the morning; deeply miserable in his two marriages and his one love affair, always at odds with some friend, continually abused by *Blackwood's* or the *Quarterly,* his former allies one by one deserting the political causes that meant so much to him. But when he came to die, his last words were: "I have had a happy life." And I dare say he was right. For perhaps the worst thing in life is to be tired, bored, indifferent, in short, to lack zest, to lack interest. And if zest and interest are the main symptoms of happiness, then Hazlitt was blessed as few men are. A man who could be thrown into such ecstasies by the paintings of Titian, by the prose of Burke, by the plays of Shakespeare, by the conversation of Coleridge, by a dispute on a fine point in metaphysics, by love, by a pun, by a prize fight, by a juggler, by the play at fives of the celebrated John Cavanagh, a man who could play at rackets for five or six hours at a time, who could lie awake a whole night playing over a shot that he had missed—could such a man really be called unhappy?

HENRY HAZLITT

Mr. Bennett Lets Us Down

Imperial Palace. By Arnold Bennett. Doubleday, Doran and Company. $2.50.

IT would be a good deal more interesting to talk about the novel Bennett might have written than to talk about the novel he did write. "Imperial Palace" is haunted—haunted by the ghost of the book somebody ought to do on the modern luxury hotel. There are pages in "Imperial Palace" on which Bennett seems to be writing that novel, pages portraying the superefficient organization of the hotel, the miracles of mechanical ingenuity with which it ministers to the comfort of its guests, the assembling of the representatives of wit, wisdom, and wealth in the modern world. It is these pages—perhaps one-third of the 769 in the book—that make one realize how close a comprehensive description of a big hotel would come to being a description of the characteristics of contemporary life.

But Bennett lost his nerve. Instead of making his novel the story of the hotel, he introduced the story of the affair between Evelyn Orcham, director of the Imperial Palace, and Gracie Savott, sporting daughter of a multimillionaire. At first the affair does not obnoxiously obtrude itself, but later it runs away with the story, and the reader participates, over a couple of hundred pages, in what the blurb writer pleasantly calls "a voyage to Cythera." When Mr. Bennett describes in great detail the conduct of the Palace he is interesting and convincing; when he describes in great detail how love came to Evelyn Orcham he is tedious and banal.

The mental processes that created "Imperial Palace" may be guessed at. In the beginning, no doubt, was the idea of a novel about a hotel. But Bennett, who is a master of potboiling, naturally hesitated to risk a book without sex appeal. Since up-to-date novelists are going in for sophistication and frankness, the Orcham-Gracie episode seemed to fill the bill. However, the purer sections of Bennett's large following had to be considered, and hence Orcham ends in the competent but strictly wholesome arms of Violet Powler. Theoretically at least, everyone ought to be satisfied.

Mr. Bennett is a great expert on what the public wants, and he is probably right. It is possible, however, that by trying to please everyone he has actually pleased no one. What would have happened if he had consistently applied the methods of "The Old Wives' Tale" in writing his story of a luxury hotel? He could have done a fine piece of journalism, not an interpretation, of course, not an imaginative re-creation, but a vivid, authentic, exciting representation. And by writing the kind of book that he alone can write, he would have pleased a good many people, more people perhaps than will be pleased by "Imperial Palace." I may be wrong, but I suspect that what the public wants from Bennett is Bennett.

GRANVILLE HICKS

The Pivot of Politics

Psychopathology and Politics. By Harold D. Lasswell. University of Chicago Press. $3.

THIS is a joy of a book. About once a year, if one is lucky, one comes across a book which opens up by its suggestiveness new lines (Professor Lasswell would object to our calling them lines but I hesitate to call them circles) of thought. As he says, "The psychopathological approach precipitates something very like a panic among those who have tried to box the manifestations of human life into conventional common-sense categories."

The prevalent distrust, however, of psychoanalysis is founded upon the suspicion that its addicts gallop across hedges and ditches until they reach their predestined conclusion, whether Freudian, Adlerian, or Jungian. It must be confessed—if we may change our metaphor—that Professor Lasswell frequently skates over very thin ice. We may be prepared to accept the general prevalence among politicians of the latent desire to murder their fathers. It will be noted that Professor Lasswell must in no sense be held to be bringing any unpleasant accusation against them on this score. The impulse is normal enough and, indeed, it happens that there would—so far as we can gather from his fascinating case-studies of the agitator and the administrator—be very little of the psychic energy which makes for success in politics were it not for the fortunate prevalence of this trait. It is clear that the Protestant Reformation and the Russian Revolution are to be attributed, by a natural transference, to a parricidal impulse against the Holy Father and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ıe Little White Father. When, however, Professor Lasswell ·ounds the "culminating nonsense" of the unity of the theo- gical Trinity upon the unconscious hatred of authority which ıagines new reasons for disbelief and meets them by magical ›rmulae, I confess to a suspicion that a desire to adhere to rthodox psychoanalytical formulae has been carried too far.

Professor Lasswell must, moreover, be careful before he ermits his unconscious urges to lead him into denouncing the octrine of the Trinity as nonsense. The chief contribution of ıis book on the new casuistry is to point out the superficiality f a theory of politics which supposes human beings to be what hey give themselves out to be—creatures of disinterested in- ellect. Professor Lasswell asks for a political psychiatry—for preventive politics." It may be, however, that the only people ince Plato who have shared this view of politics have been recisely the clergy with their "honest myths," and that the vhole Catholic structure is a vast, if slightly out-of-date, at- empt to control social and political life by psychiatry. Certainly Freud has not rejected this conclusion in his "Future of an llusion."

However this may be, democrats will have to give serious onsideration to Professor Lasswell's contention that there are laws in their pet theory that the solution of political difficulties is o be found by "promoting discussion among all the interests con- :erned in a given problem"—a theory of which the most dis- :inguished modern exposition will be found in the writings of Professor Laski. "The time has come to abandon this assump- :ion . . . The problem of politics is less to serve as a safety valve for social protest than to apply social energy to the aboli- tion of current sources of strain in society." To the reviewer, who is no irrationalist, discussion still seems important: the problem is to avoid wrangle. Professor Lasswell's book, how- ever, compels us to give attention to those deeper founts of politi- cal action the consideration of which old-fashioned liberalism tended to shirk in order that it might turn its rhetoric to the service of nobler themes. Here is an honest attempt to answer the root problem of politics: how to direct into healthy chan- nels the neurotic lust for domination, which can no more be "abolished" than any other lust.

GEORGE E. G. CATLIN

Kriegsschuldfragen

The Coming of the War, 1914. By Bernadotte E. Schmitt. Charles Scribner's Sons. Two volumes. $10.

German Diplomatic Documents, 1871-1914. Volume III: *The Growing Antagonism, 1898-1910.* Edited by E. T. S. Dugdale. Harper and Brothers. $7.50.

A Refutation of the Versailles War Guilt Thesis. By Alfred von Wegerer. Alfred A. Knopf. $3.

Portrait of a Diplomatist. By Harold Nicolson. Houghton Mifflin Company. $5.

THE history of the controversy over "war guilt" has passed through three well-marked periods. During the first the Allied indictment of the Central Powers was generally accepted at face value and it was assumed to be obvious that 1914 was primarily, if not exclusively, the work of William II and his fellow-conspirators. The second period began with doubts about the ethics of the pots calling the kettles black and culminated in extreme "revisionism," well represented in this country by Harry Elmer Barnes, Frederick Bausman, and lesser lights. The Kaiser and his ministers were now carefully whitewashed as the innocent victims of the machinations of Poincaré, Sazonov, Izvolsky, and company, who were dyed black as night in the caldrons of ink soaked from the damning documents appearing on all sides. The third period properly begins with the publication of Fay's "Origins of the World War." Its end is not yet. Almost all of the relevant documentary evidence is now in process of becoming available. Dugdale's admirable four-volume selection and translation of the wealth of material in "Die Grosse Politik der Europaischen Kabinette" now covers, in the volume just published, the period during which the Entente "encirclement" of Germany was consummated. It furnishes for the general reader not interested in research a fascinating first-hand account of Great-Power diplomacy as seen from Berlin. For the professional historian there are now available mountains of documents, and he may stand off a bit from his data and tell his story, not as a eulogy of the heroes or an indictment of the villains, but as an objective exposition of human behavior in international relations.

Professor Bernadotte Schmitt has taken a long step in this direction. His scholarly and exciting volumes constitute the most complete and well-documented account of the immediate antecedents of the war which has yet appeared in any language. He is thoroughly the historian, and never the propagandist. He has no place among the salvagers of German war guilt nor any in the lunatic fringe of "revisionism." In the reviewer's opinion, the charges recently leveled against the present work by Barnes are unworthy of serious consideration. The author has performed his task with a degree of skill, subtlety, comprehensiveness, and erudition which must command the highest respect of all who have done scientific work in the field. The tragedy of June 23–August 5, 1914, is analyzed day by day and hour by hour on the basis of a familiarity with the source materials which is unequaled by any other authority. Schmitt comes closer than any of his predecessors to a realization of the futility of the guilt-and-innocence dichotomy and of the importance of a full and fair treatment of the sequence of events. The surge of public opinion and the motives and logic of the militarists are treated almost as fully as the course of diplomatic action.

In analyzing motives and allocating responsibility Schmitt is less inclined than was Fay to condone the policies of Austria-Hungary and Germany and condemn those of Serbia, Russia, and France. In reacting against the fantasies of the extreme revisionists, he perhaps leans slightly backward in an effort to be fair to the Entente. So long as the lie of Article 231 of the Treaty of Versailles remains written into the public law of Europe the usefulness of such an effort is questionable. But Schmitt's work makes it impossible to accept any longer the view once prevalent that Berlin was duped by Vienna into supporting actions which the German leaders disapproved and the consequences of which they did not foresee. At the same time it is equally clear that the fatal steps which transformed the Austro-Serbian conflict into a world war were taken at St. Petersburg with the acquiescence of Paris. "The slipperiness of M. Sazonov appears to have been on a level with that of his confreres in Berlin and Vienna." Again, "It may be said, quite truly, that if France had declined to march with Russia, the peace of Europe would probably have been preserved"—though on terms which the Entente statesmen felt that they could not accept. In this sense, the war came by the will of the Entente. But the "unacceptable" terms of peace were willed by the Central Powers. The dispute thus revolves endlessly around words and loses itself in quibbling. Professor Schmitt is content to tell the story and let those quibble over it who will.

For those who may incline to the view that Schmitt is unduly harsh on Germany, the translation of Wegerer's "Die Widerlegung der Versailler Kriegsschuldthese" with an introduction by Barnes will provide an antidote. Wegerer is not, of course, refuting Schmitt but the original Allied indictment, which Schmitt is in no sense defending. This savors of killing a corpse, but the author has performed a useful service in analyzing the origin and content of the indictment, as contained

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the report of the Peace Conference Commission on War Responsibility, the peace treaties themselves, the ultimatum to Berlin of June 16, 1919, and the covering note accompanying it. He refutes the argument step by step and shows that the case against the Central Powers rested in part upon ignorance of the facts and in part upon deliberate misrepresentation and falsification of the evidence. At times he proves too much. The work is by intention a rhetorical polemic. But on the whole it is sound enough and a useful contribution to an understanding of the German attitude toward revision of the treaties. No one familiar with the story can avoid skepticism regarding the practical expediency of the action of the Allied statesmen in accepting so literally the ancient slogan of "Might makes Right." Bismarck and Bülow had at least a certain blunt honesty. The verdict of Versailles can never be more than the nauseous hypocrisy of the builders of moralistic façades, which have now been stripped of all plausibility and will endure only so long as Germany can be compelled by *force majeure* to support the superstructure of the Versailles system.

Harold Nicolson's charming biography of his father, Sir Arthur Nicolson (Lord Carnock), is perhaps the most readable of these recent contributions. In delightful style and with an accurate sense of narrative values and of the realities of *Weltpolitik*, he sketches the career of one of the most attractive figures of British diplomacy, producing not only an absorbing story but a valuable contribution to the accounts of the origins of the war as well. Many new sidelights are thrown on the Anglo-French and the Anglo-Russian ententes and on the crisis of 1914. The tale serves to strengthen the impression one gets from other sources that the Great War was a legitimate child of the Western state system, in which the motivations of governments and individuals are so conditioned by the forces generated within the system itself that a free choice between alternatives is almost impossible. Each statesman acts as any human being would be expected to act under similar circumstances. The circumstances are the product of the interaction of uncontrollable forces. Without control there can be no responsibility. And in international relations, as in economic life, Western bourgeois civilization is essentially anarchic and incapable of control—almost as much so now as twenty years ago. So the machine speeds toward its own destruction, of which Act I was 1914.

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN

The Flavor of Folk Poetry

Old Pastures. By Padriac Colum. The Macmillan Company. $1.50.

PADRAIC COLUM'S poetry has always the rich and eternal flavor of folk poetry, owing both to this poet's choice of themes, many of which are taken over from the Irish, and to his lyrical rhythms. In his last book, "Old Pastures," he has returned rather to the manner of "Wild Earth" than to the more sporadic treatment he used in his "Creatures." This is his own manner and his own song, springing from his Irish background, his love of old things, old legends, old grandeur, and from the sadness that spreads over the sun when old things perish. There are poems in this volume on Dublin Roads, wherein we have sketches of peasant life, on lilting love, on A Man Bereaved and keening over his loss of a wife. We feel, in general, as we read Mr. Colum, much as he describes himself feeling when he hears a tin-whistle player:

> 'Tis long since, long since, since I heard
> A tin-whistle played,
> And heard the tunes, the ha'penny tunes
> That nobody made!
>
> The tunes that were before Cendfind
> And Cir went Ireland's rounds—
> That were before the surety
> That strings have given sounds!

Although he sings for himself, there is always in his poetry the "tunes that were before Cendfind."

Mr. Colum includes in this book a set of Hawaiian chants, in part almost direct translation. The fifth section here is a beautiful translation of the famous Hawaiian *Mele Ahiahi,* or Evening Song:

> The sign is given; mighty the sign: Tapu!
> All murmurs now, speech, voice
> Subdue: inviolable let evening be.
>
> Inviolable and consecrate:
> Edgeways and staggering descends
> The sun; rain vanishes;
> A bonus of bright light comes back.
> Hawaii keeps the ordinance: Tapu!
> Even far Tahiti now is still, perhaps
> The Island's shelter-giving houses stand;
> The Chief withdraws, the sacred cup is his;
> The mothers call on Kuhe as they give
> Their babies to sleep. O early slumber
> Of the heavenly company thou art indeed!
> O Ku, O Lono, O Kane, they are yours
> The evening hours (subdue
> All murmurs now, speech, voice,
> Inviolate let evening be).
>
> It is evening; it is hallowed for being that;
> Let tumult die within us all: Tapu!
> The spies of heaven, the stars, return: Tapu!
> And peaceful heaven covers peaceful earth.

Mr. Colum has chosen for his particular field, as distinct from Yeats or Stephens, the poetry of the folk and of the folk heart. When he writes from the American scene it is as one exiled here and remembering the starlings. In "Old Pastures" he is again singing his best, or telling legends as they should be told. The essence of poetry is here, and without any striving.

EDA LOU WALTON

The Puritan Mind

The Puritan Mind. By Herbert Wallace Schneider. Henry Holt and Company. $3.

BY an appropriate coincidence the fifteen-hundredth anniversary of St. Augustine's death comes in the same year as the tercentenary of Massachusetts's birth, for the Puritans founded the Bay Colony in order to establish a City of God on earth, and fulfil the prophecy of him whom they revered as "Holy Austin." One will not often find the medievalness of the Puritans admitted, for every age conceives the past in its own image. It flattered nineteenth-century historians to imagine that the New England Puritans were liberals, rebels, and democrats; the more cynical twentieth century seeks an economic nigger in the Puritan woodpile. Then there is the matter of approach. To a person who honestly examines early New England from the best standards of today, the Puritans must be misunderstood as a gang of sadistic kill-joys, reveling in a God of wrath, and seeking to repress beauty, truth, and human nature. To one like Dr. Schneider, who approaches them from medieval church history, they appear what they seemed to themselves: a group of sincere Christians who accepted the Reformation without the Renaissance, who revolted from the materialism of Stuart England and embarked on the audacious adventure of setting up in the New World just such a Christian civilization as existed in the mind of medieval dreamers. The differences of opinion and practice between Puritan and Catholic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were nothing in comparison with the essential unity of their central principle: that man was created for the glory of God, and that human purpose in every department of life should be to glorify God and do His will. This does not make the Puritan more palatable to moderns, but it makes him comprehensible.

Accordingly, the author's opening chapter, appropriately entitled The Holy Commonwealth, is an exposition of the central theme of the four Puritan New England colonies. The phrase comes from a treatise by Richard Baxter, published in 1659. Dr. Schneider, perhaps inadvertently, gives the impression that this tract enabled the New England Puritan to rationalize his ideas. But the Holy Commonwealth idea was carefully developed in the sermon which Governor Winthrop preached on the Arbella in 1630, and he undoubtedly obtained it from the writings of earlier Puritan divines. Certain phrases, too, such as "The magistrates were usually little more than sheriffs in the minds of the clergy," indicate that Dr. Schneider is not deeply familiar with the earlier generations in New England. The union of church and state there was so close that it would be equally true to state, "The clergy were little more than prefects of the magistracy." I must also take exception to the statement that "secular arts, learning, and education were regarded as luxuries, unnecessary for the greater glory of God," having just written the better part of a book to prove the contrary. But it is only fair to say that Dr. Schneider is more concerned with what became of the Holy Commonwealth than with how it worked when it was still more or less holy.

Hard material facts, stubborn human nature, and new ideas, whether imported from Europe or deduced from the Puritans' constitution (the Bible), brought an early decay of pristine ideals. In the Reverend John Wise's "Vindication" of 1717 "we have a complete reversal of Puritan philosophy." He no longer justifies the state as nursing father to the church; the church is justified by her democratic and humanitarian values. Jonathan Edwards's task was to revive the rapidly waning sense of sin, and to rationalize the Puritan theology for a faithless generation which craved reason and symmetry. In view of the influence of Edwards and his disciples on religious thought in Scotland and New England, it is hard to agree that "with his death, his ideas lost their vitality"; but what Dr. Schneider apparently means is that Edwards's chief disciple, Samuel Hopkins, betrayed his master. "His proof was so perfect that when it failed, all was lost." But if Hopkins betrayed Edwards, was it not in the Pauline sense of emphasizing the harsher aspect of Edwards's teaching, to the neglect of his "Catholic idealism which portrays in poetic language the nature of moral ideas"?

After the death of Edwards in 1758 Dr. Schneider traces the New England Puritan mind along three distinct ways: the Hopkinsian, which faded out with the one-horse shay; the idealistic, which was carried forward by Samuel Johnson of Connecticut; and the trail of self-reliance blazed by Wise, hewed out by Jonathan Mayhew, plowed by the American Revolution, smoothed by Channing, and macadamized by Emerson. With the sage of Concord, New England Puritanism came full circle; depraved human nature was now the divine breath; the corrupt seed of Adam became god in his own right. And with this profound observation, the author concludes:

> Whenever self-reliance fails, as it sooner or later must, and sinners see themselves as God sees them, piety becomes reincarnate, though the language in which it finds expression may bear little resemblance to that of the Puritans. But whenever sinners become convinced that they are instruments in the hand of God, elected to carry out his holy will, they lose their piety and begin doing good to others. This is an ancient story, and as long as there are sinners, the story of the Puritans will be but one illustration of a universal theme.

SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON

Why Bismarck Fell

Kaiser and Chancellor. By Karl Friedrich Nowak. Translated by E. W. Dickes. The Macmillan Company. $3.50.

DICTATORS are by no means post-war phenomena. There were dictators before the World War, men infinitely cleverer and politically more powerful than the Mussolinis, Stalins, Pilsudskis, and Alexanders of today. Prince Bismarck was such a man. At the apex of his career all the political power in Germany lay in his hands, and a considerable part of Europe, consciously or otherwise, danced to the subtle music of his network of alliances and his secret treaties. Kaiser Wilhelm II was similarly a dictator in a real sense of the word, although his power found slightly different means of expression. Germany, however, could not abide two strong men at the same time; the weaker had to go. The manner of his going and the reasons therefor are here skilfully and for the first time adequately set forth.

Dr. Nowak has dropped the traditional historian's approach —that of measuring his characters by the arbitrary standards of history—and has instead looked upon them as human beings. The power of Bismarck and his ultimate overthrow by the "young master," Wilhelm, were not historic accidents; their causes lay deep in the character and personality of the two men. At the first test of strength between these two strong men, which was almost immediately after Wilhelm ascended the throne, Bismarck "still had the commanding presence of the powerful individuality that Bismarck always was, and the consciousness of his power, a power so enormous as had rarely been concentrated in the hands of a single man. His eyes still blazed with demonic fire in anger or scorn. He could still fight with hard and terrible weapons, which could strike a mortal blow if he wished." Opposed to this man of iron will was a Kaiser who as a Prince "had been restricted in his movements and shut out of life," but who now "was determined to make up for lost time, to conquer every field instantly in enhancement of his new-won glories," a Kaiser whose intelligence was "quick," whose logic was "daring," and whose "very glance was arresting."

It was inevitable that these strong men should clash, and perhaps just as inevitable that Wilhelm should win. After all, Bismarck's work was done. He had created the German Empire, and there was no other task at hand comparable in size to that. Germany continued to grow and to change, but Bismarck somehow could not change with it. He was growing old. Wilhelm, young and ambitious, was essentially of the new order of things. Yet it was not the maze of alliances and secret treaties which he had drawn too tightly about Germany and which the Kaiser and the younger generation feared that defeated Bismarck; nor was it the "mistakes" he made at home; nor yet his confession of approaching weakness in wanting to destroy the young and boisterous Social Democracy with a Napoleonic whiff of grapeshot. Despite their disagreement over these points, Wilhelm still felt that he needed the support of the other strong man. He could differ with him, but not part with him. The break came, not over a question of policy, but over the question of whether Bismarck or Wilhelm was to be the real ruler, that is, dictator, of Germany. Through a Cabinet order of 1852 Bismarck held the government ministers responsible solely to him as Chancellor; they were not to advise or consult with the Kaiser except with his permission. Wilhelm demanded the cancelation of this order, which actually operated to deprive him of control over the government. Bismarck refused and was forced to resign.

Dr. Nowak's work is not only the first authoritative account of the relations between Wilhelm II and Prince Bismarck

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(the book being based upon documents and private papers supplied by the former Kaiser at Doorn, these papers being tested by reference to a host of other published documents touching upon these relations), but it is of paramount importance as a sincere and thoroughgoing exploration of Kaiser Wilhelm's political legacy, an inheritance that led almost directly to the World War. MAURITZ A. HALLGREN

Pre-War America

Our Times. Volume III: *Pre-War America.* By Mark Sullivan. Charles Scribner's Sons. $5.

CONTINUING the admirable plan of its predecessors in the series, Volume III of "Our Times," under the title of "Pre-War America," covers the active period from 1905 to 1908. The events of the period are at most but shadowy to the younger generation of Americans whose citizenship has only recently allied them with political, business, and social responsibilities. To this class of readers the volume and its series will afford an entertaining and instructive approach to contemporary history by a writer of skill in well-balanced selection, able to comprehend and articulate in concise fashion a segment of the many-sided American scene which has come under his own intellectual ken.

For the generation just older Mr. Sullivan's diary-history will furnish a useful and graphic rehearsal of those personalities and events that held its immediate interest during the early 1900's. Roosevelt and Taft, with whose friendship the volume begins, were to be found at the center of popular interest for what they represented in the political life of the day. The friendship of these men is given the touch of spiritual intimacy. Their cooperation in statesmanship during the years that followed the beginnings of their acquaintance in Washington, when Roosevelt was a Civil Service Commissioner and Taft was Solicitor General, forms the background of the book. The growing paternalistic spirit of the more masterful type of the two toward his slower, laughter-infecting, judicial-minded fellow was fated to lead to eventual rupture; but this sequel lies within the scope of a later volume. For a long time they saw eye to eye, and shared, according to Mr. Sullivan, "a continuous concern about the country, as if the nation's affairs were a personal responsibility of the individual."

Occasion for such a feeling lay in the erratic flight of James Hazen Hyde, inheritor and exploiter of the Equitable Life. The predatory and precipitate flotation of numerous unregulated corporate ventures by associates of Hyde, whose biographies have appeared among recent books, forced into politics the new issue of government control of big business. The account given of the dilettante Hyde and his self-exile in Paris when forced to withdraw from his company is an unforgettable picture of a human product of laissez faire. Hyde and the Equitable's troubles reacted in the public consciousness as symptomatic of frenzied corporate finance and of the trend of big business generally in the hands of men who were powerful, unscrupulous, and unchecked by law.

Mr. Sullivan focuses the story of Roosevelt's determined contest with big business in his account of the President's demand upon Congress for effective regulation of railroad rates, and his struggle with his own party leaders in the Senate—Aldrich, Lodge, and others—who were unfriendly to his measure. The clashes over domestic policy during Roosevelt's Presidency were too intense not to give rise to numerous minor leaders of radical temper—to La Follette, of French extraction, nurturing his radicalism as he mulled over a copy of "Progress and Poverty," and to the fatally fluent Bryan.

A multitude of social phenomena which packed the American scene of those years is recorded in Volume III. Important among these is the account of the discovery of the hookworm malady by Stiles and Ashford and the consequent enlistment of the Rockefeller Sanitary Commission toward its extirpation. The Thaw and Orchard trials for murder, the last heresy trial, Woodrow Wilson's belief in the spread of socialistic feelings through the automobile, the prevailing styles in dress and women's hats, and a ninety-one-page account of the popular songs of pre-war days add greatly to the value and diversity of the volume. L. E. ROBINSON

Books in Brief

Camera Obscura. By William Bolitho. Simon and Schuster. $2.50.

The distinguishing mark about William Bolitho which set him apart from and beyond most journalists, as displayed in these essays from the New York *World,* was not his style, which was often unnecessarily involved and turgid, but the nature of his mind—quick, fresh, curious, and literary all at the same time. He saw New York or Chicago as a native American could never see them. He went to a play and the performance started things going in his head, so that when he wrote about it the next day he wrote about the world at the same time, his own world, original and strange. He was learned; he had been in many places; he had done many different things. Out of the richness of his experience he could draw for his comment on what he met every day in New York. This is not to say that any stranger to America could write as freshly as he did. He had a knack of putting facts together unexpectedly; some of them were for him new facts, some were old. Their juxtaposition was at once surprising and right. We have no one to replace him in American journalism.

Seven Days' Darkness. By Gunnar Gunnarsson. Translated by Roberts Tapley. The Macmillan Company. $2.

Reykjavik, the capital of Iceland, is the scene of this story of a Northern apocalypse. The sun is hidden from Reykjavik when a volcanic eruption causes a veil of ashes to hover above the city. Meanwhile an epidemic of influenza creeps off a vessel in the harbor, dealing swift death to an astonishing number of citizens. The story is confined to a group of intellectual friends who live in the shadow of the university. Its central character is Dr. Grimur Ellidagrimur, a physician who struggles vainly with the epidemic. The villain is Paul Einarsson, who arrives on the morning of the volcanic eruption and seems almost to direct the fates which slowly bring about the ruin of Dr. Ellidagrimur. After a week of horror it is Paul Einarsson who provides the coup de grace which, though consisting of but a moment's misunderstanding, drives Dr. Ellidagrimur insane. It is with the latter event that the story both ends and begins, taking the form of a cycle. Its significance does not lie so much in its action, however, as in the speeches of its characters and in the reflections of its narrator. These have a religious wisdom which is truly exceptional. There is no doubt that the author possesses a spiritual depth which 99 per cent of our authors lack. He is a man of real profundity. But he is not a novelist. The form of his novel is anything but organic. The story might have been poured into a mold. Since the apocalypse encompasses exactly one week, Mr. Gunnarsson has divided his book neatly into seven chapters, each dealing methodically with one of the seven days of darkness. His narrator gets up regularly at the beginning of each chapter and goes out to discuss the situation with the others; at the end of each chapter he goes home, deeply moved, and to bed.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is no dramatic progression. The author has not attempted to convey his story in aesthetic terms, but relies upon the horror of its events to make it effective. This does not succeed, of course, and as a result only the ideas are of value.

The Story of San Michele. By Axel Munthe. E. P. Dutton and Company. $3.75.

Memories and Vagaries. By Axel Munthe. E. P. Dutton and Company. $3.

It is hardly necessary at this late day to add to the chorus of praise for "The Story of San Michele." Dr. Munthe is evidently a man of great power of personality, of originality, courage, generosity, and learning. The amazing things which happened to him, the contacts he had with strange and interesting men and women may have been partly due to luck, as he says, partly to his profession, but mainly to his own character. With all the fascinating tales he has told, there is evidently a great deal that he has left out; he has purposely hit the high spots of thirty years of medical practice. The result is, as many thousands of persons now are aware, a book far above the average, one to read with delight and reread and ponder over. It is rather a pity that an earlier collection of essays, "Memories and Vagaries," should have been reprinted on the strength of the reception accorded "San Michele." These are slight, a little pompous, not particularly distinguished; they lack the warmth that makes "The Story of San Michele" rich and interesting.

The Giant of the Western World. By Francis Miller and Helen Hill. William Morrow and Company. $3.

The authors see American economic influence increasing in Western Europe and upon this basis attempt to erect what they term a North Atlantic civilization. They believe this civilization can be preserved and developed through "internationalization of the high seas"—to which purpose the United States presumably would lend its navy—and by international economic cooperation. "Upon the achievement of such a policy," they contend, "the peace of the world depends." The authors quite conveniently forget that Soviet Russia, China, India, the African and oceanic colonies of the European Powers, and South America are also a part of this world and may not be willing to submit to a North Atlantic world-peace policy.

A River Goes with Heaven. By Howell Vines. Little, Brown and Company. $2.

A young Alabaman writes here of the country of the Big and Little Warrior rivers with that passionate devotion to the region where he was bred which is the only tolerable kind of patriotism. He is not concerned with tilling the ground or fishing the rivers for a livelihood. He walks on the waters and soars over the trees with the birds. The love story has a little too much of the cloying sweet of malted-milk-chocolate, but the talk of the old men is rich, flavorful, and nourishing. Uncle Carl Smith, who "never could live in the city" because he wore shoes only when going to a "big gatherin'," said:

> I just love to feel the leaves, and pine straw, and sand with my feet, and walk foot logs and paths, and wade the creeks and branches.

Old Man Lat said:

> Whatever kind of a future life there may be, I'm afraid there won't be woods like these, or rivers like ours. This short life of mine, and this short enjoyment of this woods world that's been mine if ever a man owned a beautiful part of the world, bothers me sometimes. . . . It's like a man getting a drop of good, mellow, thick likker when he would like to have a barrelful, a cellarful. . . . But one thing is certain: if we ever get to a heaven anywhere, it'll be on some river. A river goes with heaven.

Music

Peace Without Euphony

THE thing generally remarked after the League of Composers' first concert of the season was the amazing lack of startling music on its program. Has the League gone tory? Its choice of works for repetition—Roger Sessions's "Choral Prelude for Organ" and Salzedo's "Harp Concerto"—does not lay it open to that charge. For these are works which, if they no longer startle, may nevertheless be classified as definitely radical in their technique.

Have our preferences as between consonance and dissonance, regular and irregular rhythms, euphony and cacophony not alone disappeared, but taken with them the definiteness of our conception of the differences between them? The complacence with which a Carnegie Hall audience could listen to Mr. Stokowski's recent performance of the "Sacre du Printemps" of Igor Stravinsky, the manifesto and the prophecy of all that many of them have been so heartily disliking for fifteen years, undoubtedly suggests an affirmative answer.

Have contemporary composers themselves disavowed their pristine radicalism, forsworn experimentation, learned their lesson, and decided that Old Virtues Are Best? The old guard are a little too anxious to cry "Hear, hear!" for they see the symptoms but diagnose them wrongly. Their implication that the battle that seems nearly over was never worth fighting shows how little they have understood it all along. For what is happening is just what they have always said could never happen. The left is laying down its arms, but only because it needs them no more.

The "Sacre" was the first adequate expression of this extraordinary revolt, a violent reaction against everything that had immediately preceded it. The nineteenth century, in seeking the sublime, had finished by bordering on the ridiculous; perhaps the twentieth by seeking the ridiculous could achieve the sublime. The nineteenth century had carried technical refinement and subtlety to immense heights, had become enormously civilized. The twentieth would try barbarism. Wagner, Strauss, Ravel had achieved enormous elaboration of the principle of definite tonality—emphasis of one central key by ever wider departures from it and inevitable returns to it; so the *jeunes gens* in France would try several keys at a time, and in Germany would chance it without any. Were the old ones solemn? We would be impudent. Did they express their emotions too freely? We'd pretend we hadn't any. Were they pompous? We must be trivial. Was their music warm, rich, highly colored, erotic? Ours must be icy, astringent, black and white, sexless.

Thus the "modernists" thought and thus, for ten or fifteen years, they wrote music. The mood was destructive of course, but fortunately all they could destroy was the ringing of "Tristan" and "Pelléas" in their own ears—and in ours. The fact that a whole evening of contemporary music contains so little of this ear-clearing, and so much that is fairly spontaneous and not too self-conscious music-making, shows not that they were wrong, but that they have got rid of what hampered and annoyed them so.

So that now we are all fast forgetting what the fight was about, and we wonder how it was that terms like "dissonance" and "irregular rhythms" and "cacophony" once had so definite a meaning. We have learned not only the relativity of euphony but the relativity of cacophony. The swords of the rebels are already three-quarters plowshares.

ARTHUR MENDEL

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WITHIN THE FORTNIGHT

Plays to See

†Art and Mrs. Bottle—See advertisement.
*Elizabeth The Queen—Guild—52 St., W. of B'way.
‡Fine and Dandy—Erlangers—W. 44 St.
*Fritz Leiber—Ambassador—49 St., W. of B'way—Begin. Dec. 25.
*Grand Hotel—National—W. 41 St.
†Inspector General—Hudson—139 W. 44 St.
†Lysistrata—44 Street—44 St., W. of B'way.
*Mrs. Moonlight—Hopkins—155 W. 49 St.
†Oh Promise Me—Morosco—W. 45 St.
†Once in a Lifetime—Music Box—W. 45 St.
*On the Spot—Forrest—49 St., W. of B'way.
*Overture—Longacre—220 W. 48 St.
†Petticoat Influence—Empire.
†The Greeks Had a Word For It—Harris—42 St., W. of B'way.
*The Green Pastures—Mansfield—W. 47 St.
†The Man in Possession—Booth—45 St., W. of B'way.
†This is New York—Plymouth—45 St., W. of B'way.
‡Three's a Crowd—Selwyn—W. 42 St.
†Tonight or Never—Belasco—44 St., E. of B'way.
†Twelfth Night—See advertisement.
†Vinegar Tree—Playhouse—48 St. E. of B'way.

* Drama. † Comedy. ‡ Musical.

Concerts and Recitals

Ruth Draper—See advertisement.
Yehudi Menuhin—Carnegie Hall—Fri. Eve., Jan. 2.
Joseph Szigeti—Carnegie Hall—Mon. Eve., Dec 29.
Philharmonic-Symphony—Carnegie Hall—Sun. Aft., Dec. 21, 28 at 3; Thurs. Eve., Dec. 25, Jan. 1; Sat. Eve., Dec. 27 at 8:45; Fri. Aft., Dec. 26 Jan. 2 and Mon. Aft. Dec. 29 at 2:30. Arturo Toscanini conducting.

For Children

Young Peoples Concert—Carnegie Hall—Mon. Aft. Dec. 29 at 2:30. Paderewski, soloist, Ernest Schelling conducting.
Grand Opera for Children—Town Hall—Fri. Dec. 26, Mon. Dec. 29, Tues. Dec. 30 at 11 A. M.
The Puppet Players in Rumpelstiltskin and Variety—233 W. 48 St., Fri. Dec 26, through Sat. Jan. 3 at 3 P. M.

Films

"Sous Les Toits De Paris"—Little Carnegie—57 St. E. of 7 Ave.
News Reel—Embassy—B'way and 46 St.
Zwei Herzen Im 3-4 Takt (German)—55 St. Playhouse—E. of 7 Ave.
Zwei Welten—Fifth Avenue Playhouse—66 Fifth Ave.
The Dream Waltz (Swedish)—8 St. Playhouse—52 W. 8 St.
With Byrd at the South Pole beginning Dec. 24—A Lady of Morals, beginning Dec. 27—The Plaza—58 St. E. of Madison Ave.

Lectures and Discussions

Dr. Louis L. Draper, Tues. Dec. 30, at 8:30 P. M.—150 W. 85 St.—See advertisement.
Peoples Institute—Cooper Union.—See advertisement.

Dinner

League for Public Discussion—25 Anniversary Dinner—253 W. 73 St.—Dec. 28 at 6:30.

Drama

Another Polite Comedy

NEIL GRANT'S "Petticoat Influence" (Gilbert Miller Theater) is a drawing-room comedy in the best English tradition. It is, to be sure, a little too much in the tradition, too much like scores of other English drawing-room comedies. Yet a thing which is done very often may finally be done very well. We are perhaps inclined nowadays to attach an entirely unwarranted importance to "originality"; we praise any play, however bungling and crude, that shows the faintest trace of that quality, and we are inclined to dismiss most plays, however finished and urbane, that seem to lack it. Yet we do not apply such standards to other means of pleasure, say automobiles. "Petticoat Influence" is as smooth and workman-like as a Cadillac. If it is also almost as standardized, it is at least standardized on a high level, and evening clothes are worn throughout the first and last acts.

The plot carries no profound or unusual implications. Richard Chalfont has long nourished the hope that he may be appointed governor of the island of Arda, one of the innumerable ingredients that make up the British Empire. He has spent seven years on the island, learned the language, made friends with the natives, written a monumental work on the history and customs—in fact, he is the one man for the job. But he learns that the Earl of Darnaway has already virtually appointed his own wife's uncle. It is here that Chalfont's wife, portrayed by Helen Hayes, takes a hand, unearths a liaison between the Earl's secretary and his wife, and after the usual complications straightens things out to the satisfaction of nearly everyone.

Now this may sound very trifling, and perhaps at bottom it is, yet the characterization is shrewd and delicate, the people are so polished and unscrupulous, the dialogue, if never exactly brilliant, is so constantly agreeable, the situations are managed with such professional competence, that one puts in, altogether, a very pleasant evening. The cast, moreover, particularly Reginald Owen as the secretary, Henry Stephenson as the Earl of Darnaway, and Helen Hayes herself, seems to squeeze the last drop of value out of its material.

H. H.

Contributors to This Issue

W. T. Stone is the Washington representative of the Foreign Policy Association.
Paul Y. Anderson is the national correspondent of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*.
Selden Rodman is coeditor of the *Harkness Hoot*.
Joel I. Seidman is a young economist who has made a special study of the yellow-dog contract.
Ferdinanda W. Reed has studied elementary schools in both the United States and Russia.
Virginia Moore is the author of a book of poems, "Sweet Water and Bitter."
George E. G. Catlin has recently published "A Study of the Principles of Politics."
Frederick L. Schuman is a member of the department of political science at the University of Chicago.
Samuel Eliot Morison, professor of history at Harvard, is the author of "Builders of the Bay Colony."
L. E. Robinson is professor of English at Monmouth College.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Holiday Interlude

EMBASSY
THE NEWS REEL THEATRE
B'way and 46th Street — ANY TIME 25c ANY SEAT — Continuous 10 A.M. to Midnight
Complete change of Program weekly—Midnight Shows every Sat.

"LYSISTRATA"
"If you can throw back your head nad laugh, unabashed, at the grandly comic spectacle of life, you will find this 'Lysistrata' an event you will long remember."—*Richard Lockbridge, The Sun.*
FORTY-FOURTH ST. Theatre, W. of B'way. Eves. 8:40 Mats. Xmas wk., Fri., Dec. 26 & Sat.

AMERICAN PREMIER
NOW PLAYING
Rene Clair's French Talking and Singing Film Masterpiece
"SOUS LES TOITS DE PARIS"
(Under the Roofs of Paris)
Acclaimed an artistic triumph in Europe and America
LITTLE CARNEGIE Playhouse 57th ST. EAST of 7th AVE. Popular Prices Direction Leo Brechet

"A SMASH HIT"—*Walter Winchell, Mirror*
"Joe Cook perfectly marvelous and the show perfectly beautiful"—*Heywood Broun, Nation.*
JOE COOK in "FINE and DANDY"
HIS NEWEST, MADDEST MUSICAL
ERLANGER'S THEATRE—W. 44th St.—PEN. 7963
Evening 8:30; Matinees, Wed. and Sat., 2:30

Kenneth Macgowan and Joseph Verner Reed present
JANE COWL In a Repertory of Two Plays
ART AND MRS. BOTTLE Wed. Mat. & Eve., Dec. 31 and Jan. 1, 2 and 3.
TWELFTH NIGHT Wed. Mat. & Eve., Dec. 24; Thurs., Dec. 25; Fri., Dec. 26; Sat. Mat. & Eve., Dec. 27; Mon. Eve., Dec. 29, Tues. Eve., Dec. 30
MAXINE ELLIOTT'S THEATRE, 39th St., E. of B'way
Eves. at 8:40. Mats. Wed. and Sat., 2:40

The Theatre Guild Presents
ELIZABETH, THE QUEEN
MARTIN BECK THEA. 45th Street, West of Eighth Avenue. Eves., 8:40. Mats. Thurs. & Sat., 2:40

"Robert E. Sherwood's best play."—Brown, Post.
Arthur Hopkins presents
This Is New York
A New Comedy by Robert E. Sherwood with LOIS MORAN
PLYMOUTH THEATRE 45th St., W. of Broadway. Eves. 8:40 Mats. Xmas week: Fri., Dec. 26 & Sat.

Dwight Deere Wiman presents
MARY BOLAND in her gayest Comedy Hit
VINEGAR TREE
HOLIDAY Fri., Dec. 26; Sat., Dec. 27; Tues., Dec. 30;
MATINEES: Wed., Dec. 31; Fri., Jan. 2; Sat., Jan. 3.
PLAYHOUSE THEATRE, W. 48th St. Bryant 2628
Evenings 8:40. Matinees at 2:40.

Opening Fri. Eve., Dec. 26—The Actor Managers, Inc., Present
RUTH DRAPER
in her original character sketches
Engagement limited to 4 weeks—Program Changed Daily
COMEDY THEATRE, 41st St. E. of Bway. Mats. Thurs. & Sat., 2:30; Eves. (incl. Sun.), Dec. 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, Jan. 1 and 2. Price $1-$3

□ DINNER □

THE LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY
invites you to its
25TH ANNIVERSARY DINNER
Sunday evening, December 28th, at 6:30 P.M.
at the
LEVEL CLUB
253 West 73rd Street, New York
Subject: OUR MACHINE CIVILIZATION—WHAT NEXT?
Speakers: "A. E." George Edward Russell, Morris Hillquit, Harry W. Laidler
Chairman: Norman Thomas
TICKETS, $2.50 STUDENT TICKETS, $1.50
Make reservations at the office of the L.I.D., 112 East 19th Street

□ DANCES □

NEW YEAR'S EVE COSTUME, DANCE AND CABARET
RAND BALLROOM, 7 E. 15th ST.
Tamiment Eight Orchestra — Dancing Till Dawn
FUN GALORE — MARDI GRAS — ENTERTAINMENT
$1.00 in advance — $1.25 at door
Call AL 4-3094 for reservations

NEW YEAR'S EVE
ARTISTS' COSTUME BALL
PLAYBOY'S FETE FUTURISTE
CUBIST COSTUME CARNIVAL
IN GREENWICH VILLAGE
At Webster Hall Wednesday Evening
119 East 11th St. : December 31
Tickets in advance, $3.00 : : At door, $5.00
By mail from PLAYBOY, 32 Union Square
Telephone Stuyvesant 9687
DANCING AT 10—TILL DAWN
Costume or Evening Dress obligatory

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Balance Sheet of the Revolution

By BLAS URREA

[*Blas Urrea is the pen name of Luis Cabrera. Señor Cabrera is one of the original and outstanding intellectual figures of the Mexican revolution, and was an associate of the first leader of the movement, Francisco I. Madero. During the early years of the revolution he filled many important posts in various governments, including that of Finance Minister in the Cabinet of President Carranza. He is now retired from public life and revolutionary-political activities and is practicing law in Mexico City. This review was written by him and published in* El Excelsior *of Mexico City, a daily newspaper of government affiliations, on the twentieth anniversary of the first outbreak of the revolution, November 20, 1910.*]

EVERY anniversary brings with it the necessity of balancing accounts. The commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the revolution imposes the duty of considering the situation of our country. Upon compiling this balance sheet it is necessary, above all else, not to permit one's thoughts to be distracted by the contemplation of transitory personalities and secondary phenomena, but to focus the attention exclusively upon the fate of the fundamental principles which were adopted as the platform of the revolution.

Many men, each according to his scale and the limitations of his capacities, contributed to the overthrow of the Díaz regime and to the reformation of our institutions. Many of these died. It is sad to say that most of them were sacrificed by the revolution itself and that Mexico, more than any other country, has devoured its own sons. It was the minority that fell in battle fronting the enemies of the revolution. It must be observed that among those listed among the forerunners and initiators of the revolution, the greater part of those that still live have retired from active public life and are now taking no part in revolutionary government affairs, some of their own volition, but more because, by reason of circumstances, they are not in a position to do so, or because they are not deemed worthy of a seat at the banquet table, to which many are called but few chosen.

But what should chiefly be analyzed on this anniversary is not the fate of the men of the revolution, but the condition in which its principles remain, coupled with a frank statement of wherein these principles have advanced or retrograded. For the most part, unfavorable comparisons are based upon the present state of our institutions and the conditions which prevailed in the latter days of the Díaz regime. The unfavorable conditions are explained, or at least we provide ourselves with the illusion of explaining and excusing them, by saying that it is naturally to be expected that in the wake of a revolution public and private liberties should continue to be restrained or sacrificed in order to bring about the betterment of the masses of the people. Effective suffrage and no reelection were the two ideals which were considered as basic in the epoch during which a majority of the revolutionists saw in the movement something mor than the political problems involved.

Effective suffrage endured for a fleeting moment of ou history through the triumph of the revolution of 1910 [le by Madero against Díaz], only to be extinguished almos at once. Upon the triumph of the revolution of 1913 [b the Constitutionalists under Carranza against the Huert reactionary government] the suffrage became nothing mor than an exclusive privilege of the victors. At present on can use the phrase "effective suffrage" in Mexico only as a euphemism. It is true that in the time of Díaz there wa no suffrage and no pretense of it; but it is to be regrette that after we had fought to obtain it and had for a momen seen it gleam, it should have again disappeared from the political horizon without leaving to us any hope for its reestablishment. Still, the lack of effective suffrage at present is not to be imputed exclusively to the fault of the political authorities, but in great part to the apathy and indifference of the citizens and above all to their skepticism of the good faith of those in power, consequent upon the crushing brutality of political leadership.

In 1910 continuous office-holding was considered the principal cause of the political stagnation of Mexico; hence the theory of no reelection became a fundamental principle of the revolution of that year. It penetrated so deeply into the national consciousness and was considered to be so firmly established in our institutions that even Carranza himself was overthrown and sacrificed upon the altar of the principle of no reelection [in 1920, when his government was wrecked and he was killed by the Sonoran rebels headed by Obregón, Calles, and De la Huerta because he was held to be trying to impose his own candidate in succession to himself in the Presidency].

Although this same principle was inscribed upon the banner of Tuxtepec [the revolution by which Díaz in 1876 first came to power], it was later erased by General Díaz. But it always retained such an intense vitality that the dictator himself in his final days of office [in 1910, when his government was menaced by the Madero movement] recognized it and asked that it be written anew into our political constitution. No one in 1910, much less in 1917, when the new constitution was being sworn to, would have thought that in exactly ten years this principle of our fundamental law would be eradicated for reasons of purely personal political convenience. [This refers to the amendment to the constitution put through in 1925 by the Obregón faction to permit the reelection of Obregón in 1928.]

Here, without doubt, is the most painful example of the manner in which the principles of the revolution have been flouted. The gravity of the matter lies not so much in the fact that the principle of no reelection has been eliminated from our Magna Charta for personal reasons, but that it was not restored immediately after the death of General Obregón.

During the revolution of 1910 the social problems which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were the true causes of the revolution had not yet been brought out distinctly. Madero and his supporters always believed that the entire Mexican problem consisted in the political questions of suffrage and no reelection. It was not until after the assassination of Madero and Vice-President Pino Suárez [in 1923, after Huerta had seized the government], and as a result of the revolution against the Díaz reaction headed by Huerta, that problems of a social and economic character began to be clearly discerned, although they had been pointed out long before by Andrés Molina Enríquez and Luis Cabrera. It was then that there appeared the truly transcendental principles of the revolution, the most prominent of which we shall analyze.

It must be admitted that illiteracy, and especially the ignorance of the Indians and the lower classes, has been considerably reduced. Among the results of the revolution, education of the masses has been perhaps the most effective and enduring, owing not alone to the technical force of the scholastic culture initiated by Pavavicini and continued by Vasconcelos [former ministers of education], but above all to the practical education derived by all social classes from the great ebb and flow over the country of human masses, a movement produced by the military campaigns of civil warfare which did much to bring Mexicans from different parts of the nation together for the first time.

The danger which now confronts the educational progress of the republic lies in the invasion of Protestant American instruction, with its consequent corruption of our language, and in the distillations of ultra-modern teachers who with their windy shrillings and literary and artistic decadence place in jeopardy the essential end of the school, the education of the masses, and sacrifice the extensive culture of the people for the sake of a technical, utopian training, the principles of which are not unallied to considerations of political convenience of interest to those who control our educational processes.

The division and distribution among the people of Mexico's ancient system of large land-holdings as a means of improving the condition of the peasant is the pretext of which perhaps the greatest use has been made for serving sordid ends and political ambitions without, so far, accomplishing anything fundamental or sensible in connection with the agrarian problem. However great may be the amount of land that has been parceled out, the results of the revolutionary agrarian policy come far short of compensating for the sacrifices which they have imposed upon our national economy. The unjustified distributions which have been made proclaim their injustice in the untilled state of the land. Those who were entitled to land and who have been given it legally lack capital with which to cultivate it. The forests are being rapidly cut away. The economic state of the peasant has not improved. There are no guaranties for the small landowner. The agricultural production of Mexico continues to decrease, and the tendency is for property expropriated for agrarian purposes to fall into the hands of the bosses [political or military leaders]. Huge estates protected by political influence, bureaucratic corruption, or the complicity of military chiefs continue intact, free from expropriations, wholly immune, in contrast to a vast number of smaller rural properties which have supplied the only food for the voracity of the peasants, egged on by their agrarian leaders. On the other hand, new large land-holdings have

The Holiday Interlude

Rand School of Social Science
7 E. 15th ST. AL 4- 3094

PAUL BLANSHARD
Racketeering: High and Low
Saturday, Dec. 27, 2 P. M.
WINTER TERM BEGINS JANUARY 5th
Write for Booklet

To THE GROUP: "At last a civilized club, in an uncivilized country, they tell me, prodigious!"—GEORGE BERNARD SHAW.

THE GROUP
A Clearing House of Opinion
Meets at Auditorium—150 West 85th Street
Tuesday, December 30th, at 8:30 P. M.

DR. LOUIS L. DRAPER
will speak on:
"Dr. Jung's Analytical Psychology and The Search for Happiness"

Sunday Afternoon Discussion Group, Jan. 4th, at 4:30 P. M.
SEYMOUR A. SELIGSON
(Staff Lecturer for Free Library Lecture Soc.)
will speak on:
"The Meaning of Culture"

Tea Served Founded 1918 Subscription 50c
(Weekly notices mailed on request)

Other Holiday Interlude announcements on page 743

LABOR'S ANSWER TO STARVATION

President Hoover's paper programs and the scanty relief of Community Chests will not prevent starvation this winter in fat and wealthy America. They will, however, encourage the growth of radicalism and the revival of militancy among the masses of this country's 40,000,000 workers.

Read the story of that revolt week by week, as gathered by Federated Press, labor's news service, and published in LABOR'S NEWS, the weekly news magazine of the labor movement. "I find LABOR'S NEWS reports the most significant news in this country, and does it comprehensively and concisely," writes an Ohio college instructor in economics. Do your duty by this coupon and read the news the billion-dollar press refuses to print.

FEDERATED PRESS
112 East 19th Street
New York, N. Y.

☐ $2 for 1 year
☐ $1 for 6 months
☐ Complimentary copy

Enclosed is a $2 bill. Send me LABOR'S NEWS for one year.

Name _____
Street _____
City _____

When writing to advertisers please mention The Nation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been formed of the old ones, ownership merely having passed from one person to another, while others are being constituted on a basis of modern agricultural technique. Large foreign land-holdings, protected by diplomatic immunity [this evidently refers partly to the case of a consular representative of the United States government who has obtained and holds several huge haciendas in the state of Puebla], provide a pretext and an example for the defense of Mexicans who own extensive tracts of arable land.

To sum up, the revolutionary purpose of dividing the great estates of the country has been almost entirely overlooked. Land distributions have affected only the holdings of the small and middle proprietors, and the new small holdings which have been created display sparse effective results so far as agricultural production is concerned, with tremendous cost to the national economy, which is seriously menaced by the insecure state of the titles and the control of rural properties.

Undoubtedly the social and economic status of the worker has improved in the past twenty years, but this has been brought about at the cost of sacrificing national industry. Only those industries are able to live and flourish which are protected and financed from outside Mexico. It is painful to have to confess that the improved condition of the Mexican industrial worker, like that of the peasant, is principally due to reasons of a political order, depending upon the electoral factor supplied by the industrial employees and the continuance of the control of the labor vote by political labor leaders. This was initiated in 1920, when the politicians and the labor leaders began to traffic in promises, advantages for the worker being offered in return for his political alliance and support.

When in 1914 the old federal army was disbanded, it was believed that the gangrene of militarism, which was one of the evils of the Díaz regime, had been cured. However, the militaristic virus had reached to the marrow of our society, and when the federal army disappeared, the revolutionary army corps of the northwest, the north, and the northeast fell heir to the malady of pretorianism, which later manifested itself in our new revolutionary army in the form of an epidemic of acute militarism, with accessions of revolts. A diagnosis of these proved that they were of the same quality as the army uprisings of 1913 [against Madero], which succeeded, as did that of 1920 [against Carranza]; or as those of 1923 [against the Obregón Government], of 1927 [against the Calles Government], and of 1929 [against the Portes Gil Government], all of which latter failed. In actuality, militarism in Mexico is a malady the possibilities of which are masked in the shadows of prognostication, and the results of which one cannot yet regard hopefully, notwithstanding the reorganization of the army. Not even the temporary lack of an influential military leader to head a revolt constitutes a tranquilizing symptom.

The relaxation of the administrative morale is one of the gravest evils from which the country is suffering as a consequence of the revolution. In all epochs of our history there have always existed corruption, tyranny, and political assassinations. But even though the existence of these was notorious, they were regarded as crimes, or moral sores, which naturally were to be hidden or glossed over. The seriousness of the present situation is that we have lost our sense of shame and our conceptions of good and evil to the degree that boasts are made of tyrannical brutalities as though they were the gifts and acts of statesmanship; that the fact of a person in authority having rapidly accumulated a fortune through peculation or fraud is regarded as merely indicating on his part a meritorious provision for his future welfare.

The protection of life, liberty, and property is now not a normal function of our administrative authorities, but something which one must seek in an appeal to justice. Unfortunately, the Blind Goddess is bankrupt and in a state of progressive disintegration. Even the federal Supreme Court, which should be the moderating power, has been dominated by the trend of the times and has declared itself on strike. It shrugs its shoulders helplessly before the prevailing judicial corruption and ignorance [in the lower courts], washes its hands of administrative spoliation, and admits its impotence in the face of outrages against the law proceeding from military sources.

The nationalistic tendency of the revolution crumbled completely as soon as we permitted a regime of "capitulations" to become part of the conventions entered into between Mexico and the United States in 1923, which later were amplified to include Europe, thus sanctioning a condition of privilege for foreigners. In the terrain of economy, instead of seeking to bring about the development and exploitation of our natural resources by our own efforts, we are buying African corn, Canadian wheat, American eggs, depending more and more upon importations from abroad for the satisfaction of our prime necessities. Even the things which we produce in Mexico, from electrical power to Virginia cigarettes, omitting gasoline and metals, are products of the investment of foreign capital, to consume which we are obliged to pay in the equivalent of dollars.

In federal finance, if much has been gained in the minutiae of bookkeeping and in fiscal ferocity, the penury of the treasury has been correspondingly accentuated by the drainage of wasteful budgets and by the consumption of our sources of income. We are as yet unable to balance our budgets, but in exchange we are on the road to emancipating ourselves from our European creditors by heroically delivering ourselves into the hands of our Yankee creditors.

The complete balance sheet of the revolution would be tremendously extensive and complex if one cared to take the trouble to review in detail all the phases of our public life. This article does not provide opportunity for fixing the responsibilities of the revolutionists or of the enemies of the revolution for the deficiencies in the principles of the revolution or their failures or retrogressions from them.

It is sufficient to say in summary that some of the items on the balance sheet are frankly favorable—education and the economic and social betterment of the masses—while others—relating to our institutions, liberties, national economy, political sovereignty—are lamentably unfavorable.

As an anniversary proposition, worthy of the recollections which the day brings, recommendation is made of the adoption of the formula recently uttered by President Ortiz Rubio; namely, seriously to commence revolutionary reconstruction on a basis of common sense, honor, and patriotism. In this manner those who are sufficiently brave and honest to look squarely in the face the situation in which we find ourselves may discern a remedy for our ills, if they may yet be cured without resorting to a fresh revolution, which would endanger our nationality itself.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED